







# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

Vol. IV.—APRIL, 1879.—No. 14.

---

THE OUTLOOK, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL, IN  
EUROPE.

IF we review the events of the past twelve months, a series of criminal attacks on the lives of sovereigns in Europe arrests our attention. Twice within a few weeks the assassination of the Emperor William, of Germany, was attempted. Thereupon bills, designed to suppress the socialistic movement, were introduced into the then sitting Parliament, and when it refused to pass them its dissolution was ordered. New elections took place, the Parliament assembled and finally sanctioned the anti-socialist bill. It was put into operation with rigorous severity, and is now in full force. Yet still socialism, which is aiming at nothing less than the overthrow of "the powers that be," continues to infect the whole German Empire. In Italy, the discovery of a plot against King Humbert's life, led to the adoption of stringent measures to stay the farther growth and aggressions of the secret revolutionary societies which infest that kingdom throughout its entire extent. Turning to Russia, we find despotism there grappling with a sinister foe, "Nihilism." Murders shrouded in impenetrable mystery, agitate St. Petersburg and Moscow, and in all their appalling atrocity still live fresh in memory. The autocratic power of the North has concentrated all its energies upon the suppression of this internal and fatal force, and the partial closing of the Russian Universities must be regarded as a necessary measure of precaution which the government has been compelled to adopt for the avoidance of more violent and greater collisions than have already occurred. Only a few months ago the cabinet of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was informed by the secret police of Berlin of the existence of a conspiracy against



the life of Emperor Francis Joseph. There is every reason to believe that this timely warning alone prevented in Vienna an occurrence similar to, and, perhaps, more tragical than the one "Unter den Linden," in Berlin. In Spain, likewise, the young King Alfonso has been threatened with a premature end by the hand of an assassin, and the scaffold on which the would-be murderer paid the penalty for his crime is still warm with his blood. Attack followed attack in rapid succession. And if an isolated occurrence, the object of which consists in taking the life of a crowned head, may be regarded as of serious importance, then an array of facts, like those before us, certainly has a formidable significance.

For some time past it has been evident to all reflecting minds that we live in a period the near future of which is fraught with dangers of the gravest character. We seem, indeed, to be on the eve of a social upheaval, which threatens to be of unprecedented magnitude, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the whole civilized world is more or less confronted with problems, the solution of which threatens the welfare and peace of human society. Those who can and do read the "signs of the times," have not failed to perceive unmistakable indications of decay, if not of dissolution. They note with apprehension and alarm the premonitory warnings which invariably precede the outbreak of most destructive tempests. Within the last year the situation has become such as must disabuse even the optimist of his dreams, and compel even the skeptic to believe in the gravity of the political and social condition of Europe. France, in 1789, raised a cry for "liberty, equality, and fraternity," and since then this cry has constantly resounded over all continental Europe. For upwards of eighty years the ideas called into life by that great revolution have been at work, silently making proselytes, and the results are now before the world.

If we wish to understand the crisis, it will not suffice to acquire a merely superficial knowledge of the startling theories of the day. It is also necessary to examine into their real nature and essence. The doctrines which cause uneasiness in all social and political circles are not apparitions of to-day; they have a genesis, a growth and a mature development. We propose, therefore, in this paper, to ascertain the sources from which they have sprung, rather than merely to describe their present form.

The drift of communistic ideas was so graphically illustrated during the siege of Paris that it seems waste of time and space to enter now upon their discussion. Socialism, the menacing danger of Germany, presents, it is true, a less hideous aspect than the monstrous head of the "Commune;" but it converges, nevertheless, in its ultimate consequences, into communism. In fact,



this is found to be the case with all the "isms," when thoroughly examined. They have, all alike, a decidedly destructive tendency; they aim at the abolition of authority, at the overthrow of the present governments, at the demolition of the existing social and political order. What they propose is, in short, the emancipation of man from all those restrictions which society necessarily imposes upon man as a social being. The only possible means by which this grand result can be accomplished is, of course, a general revolution, doing away completely, once and forever, with the old order of things, and then society will have to be reconstructed on an entirely new basis.

It is not uninteresting here to observe how arguments abound as long as the necessity of pulling down is under discussion, but when that part of the process is reached where the work of rebuilding ought to be explained, diligent search generally reveals but—a vacuum. The identity of the end indicates an identical starting-point, and there is in reality one common principle which underlies all the modern doctrines. They vary only in their own formulations, and these slight diversities are easily explained by the preponderance of certain differing circumstances where they originated and first obtained. The various characters of nations have imprinted characteristic marks upon them. But apart from these purely accidental differences, the underlying principle of all is, as we have said, but one, and constitutes what has been called, with a good deal of sarcastic humor, "the creed of the nineteenth century," namely, the abolition of religion as belief in a supernatural order, and its replacement by the cultus of society.

Thus, we hear, on one side, complaints that the tide of infidelity which has set in, threatens in its onward flow to destroy religion; while, on the other side, it is urged that religion is an institution which has outlived its time, and must not be allowed to stand in the way of modern science. Modern science, we are told, diffuses light, frees from bigoted prejudice and places man on the firm ground of intelligence and reason, elevating him into a sphere where he soars with mighty wings above the narrowing influences of creeds and the debasing fear of eternity.

The intellectual hunger of the nineteenth century for knowledge cannot be satisfied with the husks of religious superstition. Science, it is urged, frees man from the bondage in which mind has been held and loosens the fetters which for centuries prevented him from advancing to the place to which his intellect entitles him in creation. Science restores him to liberty, because it restores him to reason. Therefore science transforms the slave into a freeholder, and man into the lord of creation. Behold, it is said, how scientific progress undermines the very foundations on which religion

stands, how doctrine after doctrine disappears as a mere phantom before that clear light which banishes all darkness; behold, how that ghost "revelation" dwindles and shrinks into nothing before the brilliant rays of scientific knowledge, which rests not on superstition, nor on speculation, but on the firmer and stronger ground of matters of fact.

Here we have a synopsis of the line of argument followed by modern free-thought, as we find it embodied in the startling theories of the times. Mankind is exhorted to discard henceforth all narrow-mindedness and to adopt, in keeping with the spirit of the age, the broad, liberal views of modern progress. There is, indeed, a fascination in the language and a certain ingenuity in the way by which the leading spirits of modern thought allure the masses. Their arguments are plausible, and seem to superficially thinking minds to rest on true premises. Then, too, the temptations held out to the multitude are great and often prove irresistible. It has always been a distinguishing feature of the great bulk of mankind to accept, nay, to embrace willingly and without questioning, doctrines which meet half-way, as it were, their own wishes and desires. Now, the abolition of Deity means, beyond all doubt, if it means anything, freedom from responsibility; and this exemption from accountability implies full sway to passion and desire. Then, again, we must not forget how our passions are ever ready to serve us an ill turn, and to call to their aid our imperfect or superficial knowledge. In preceding ages the masses, we grant readily, possessed less knowledge than they now have; but a multitudinous and hence, in most cases, a very superficial knowledge, is at best a possession of questionable value. Pope says, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and this, it seems to us, is precisely the kind of knowledge which prevails in our days. We must remember that even the scientific man who omits to make experience his guide—as many men of science in our day, unfortunately, are but too apt to do—will wander in the regions of idle speculation and sink into the quicksands of skepticism. Denham's

"Can knowledge have no bounds, but must advance  
So far as make us wish for ignorance?"

explains to a certain extent the prevalence of error. The "spherical expansion" of the human intellect, and not expansion in one direction only, as demanded by Fichte, implies that our knowledge is incomplete unless we supplement the results of our own line of research by knowledge drawn from other sources, made accessible to us by the labors of others. Yet here, we believe, we have reached the reason why modern science introduces a grating dis-



cord into the harmony of the universe. Every student who devotes himself to science must unquestionably select a single subject for the exercise of his own faculties for original investigation, "one line," as Professor Tyndall says, "along which he may carry the light of private intelligence a little way into the darkness by which all knowledge is surrounded." Thus the mathematician ought to restrict his labors to the relation of space and numbers; the astronomer to resolving the stellar masses and determining planetary movements; the biologist, to the conditions and phenomena of life; the chemist, to the atoms of matter, their combinations, affinities and reactions; and the disciple of the physical sciences, to the discovery of the laws which regulate the optical, acoustic, magnetic and electric phenomena. Each science in its advance is benefited in a greater or less degree by the advance made in others, and "spherical expansion" requires the student to take cognizance of this progress. Greatness and ability in one department, however, by no means involve greatness and ability in another. And since this is true in departments of knowledge that are closely related to each other, with how much greater force must it not apply when, by a total misconception of "spherical expansion," men of science leave their sphere altogether and venture upon ground which they cannot and, as a matter of fact, do not, know? The natural sciences have invaded the territory of metaphysics; no branch of science appears to consider itself complete nowadays, until it has forced an entrance into the vexed ocean of theology. *There*, it is, of course, a failure; but the failure becomes all the more deplorable, because this departure into realms in which it has no right to rule, realms unknown and unexplorable by it, influences in a most pernicious way the drift of thought amongst the masses.

As an instance, we take the theory of evolution. Prof. Huxley's merit as a physicist stands unquestioned. The theory of evolution, as long as confined to the physical order, is an admirable triumph of scientific research. It acquires an unscientific, and, therefore, dangerous character only when it is pushed beyond its legitimate bounds. Prof. St. George Mivart has very ably proved that the assertion of the evolution of new species is perfectly consistent with the strictest Christian theology; that there can be no conflict between evolution and revelation, since creation, "in potentia" does not imply creation "in actu." Evolution from matter into spirit is, however, by the intrinsic nature of both, an absolute impossibility, for which reason it has well been styled "scientific lunacy." But how many minds, let us ask, have sufficient quickness and power of penetration, sufficient perspicuity of thought, to perceive the exact extent to which the theory may legitimately be accepted, and where, exactly and why, it becomes repugnant to reason? We presume

their number is very limited. A great many read about the theory of evolution, and regard it as a deathblow to religion and the supernatural order. As a natural consequence, they begin to doubt whether, after all, the Christian ideas of God, of man's origin, of a world to come, etc., are not wrong, and require, at the very least, reconstruction. From that condition to atheism, there is but one step. The philosopher, the man of science, the highly educated portion of human society, are not so easily misled; but multitudes always have and always will blindly follow their leaders, and when once started, they often go farther than their leaders themselves. And, indeed, when we consider that it requires the consummate skill of a ripe scholar, and not the imperfect knowledge of a tyro, to discover false logic, and to lay open the fallacies of false conclusions, we can hardly wonder at the readiness with which the great majority of persons have appropriated the new, and, at first sight, attractive doctrines of modern physical and sociological scientists, and we can understand why the masses are now completely captivated and led willingly along the way to their own perdition. If the belief in God and His revelation is once shaken, it is soon and easily cast aside altogether. Defect of education, injudicious training, and want of judgment, co-operate to make the bulk of the people at first unconscious receptacles of rationalism and skepticism, and afterwards fanatical adherents of communism and socialism.

To the causes already mentioned, we must now add another fact, which is, the wonderful facilities for propagating knowledge in our times. Our age is the age of steam and electricity. And steam and electricity are both subservient to the press. A few generations ago it took comparatively a very long time before a theory left the study of the savant, and became common property of the many. Not so in our days. The telegraph and the press enable us to read a lecture four hours after its delivery, hundreds and thousands of miles away. True, in most cases, the information imparted consists only of a brief summary; but the few leading thoughts that are given, are caught, and they are, moreover, believed on the strength of the established standing of those who utter them. In this way, then, the "creed of the nineteenth century" has spread and permeated and saturated human society to an alarming extent. The disaster lies mainly in the disproportion in which a pernicious hypothesis affects "les hommes qui savent" and "les hommes qui ne savent pas." We are not prepared to call a Huxley, a Darwin, a Herbert Spencer, atheists. They share, we think, largely the feelings of Physicus, who writes:

"For inasmuch as I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the 'new faith' is a desirable substitute for the waning splendor of the 'old,' I am not ashamed to confess that, with this virtual negation of God,



the universe has lost to me its soul of loveliness. And when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence, as now I find it, at such times I shall ever find it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible."

The bravado of defiant arrogance is often but the mask of a sinking heart. The first-rate men of science have been misled by science misapplied. Science correctly applied, may lead them eventually back. But science is not a possible remedy for the many who have gone astray through the fault of the few.

When the masses have once quaffed of that delicious elixir of life, the "creed of the nineteenth century," they may be said to enter upon a stage of intoxication where every successive step seems to be certain and right.

Their reasoning is logical, and if the correctness of the premises could be granted, it would be impossible to find fault with the deductions drawn from them. If there is no hereafter, then, most assuredly, man looks forward in vain to it for the equalization and proper adjustment of the inequalities of this world. If our life ends forever with the term of our terrestrial existence, then surely we would be guilty of egregious folly if we looked to a future life as that where the unquenchable desire for happiness, the prime motor of all human action, will be gratified. But inequalities in the conditions of life do exist; they are realities. So, too, does the desire for happiness exist and clamor for satisfaction. What is more natural, therefore, than that those who have lost their belief in a world to come, should turn to this world and demand from it attainment of happiness, as well as a more equitable distribution of the conditions of comfortable existence? If we are exactly on the same level with the brute, which is born, lives, dies, and therewith ceases to exist, why should we have less enjoyment than the brute? And, again, why should the poor fail to perceive and note the superior advantages for the satisfaction of earthly desires and the attainment of earthly happiness which the wealthy possess? If there is nothing beyond the grave, why should not the poor relieve his miserable, wretched condition by appropriating to himself a part of the surplus riches of his wealthy neighbor? Enticing dreams of ease and luxury and pleasure and enjoyment begin to fill the imagination of the pauper, and the more he broods the stronger grows his conviction that he only proposes what is just when he demands a division of the riches of the world. As a child, perhaps, he entertained some notions of a God who rewards the righteous and punishes the unjust. Cast into the turmoil of life these notions gradually drift out of his mind; and in proportion as he discards them, in like proportion the intensity of his yearnings increase, and

make him the prey and the victim of communistic and socialistic ideas of the worst type. Yet, before long, he discovers that his imagined rights, upon which he bases his claims for radical changes in the social order, do not coincide at all with what the government under which he lives regards as his rights; and at every turn he finds himself in collision with the "powers that be." This state of affairs sets him to reasoning again. He asks, what right has man to command man? What obedience can man exact from man except the obedience compelled by superior force?

Authority ceases to be authority if its title is not derived from God, and how can that be anything else than a baseless pretension, since there is no God? Thus, governments become in his eyes the instrumentalities by which the ruling few utilize, for the furtherance of their own ends, the many. The formidable machine, "the State," is merely devised to keep the many in subjection, that by their labors they may promote the happiness of the few. Now, the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" reaches his ear, and he shrinks no longer from trying his strength in an issue, the result of which in his opinion, will be an amelioration of his condition.

We have thus tried to give a fair description of the process by which the doctrines of the day have come to menace the peace and welfare of society, and here we must remark, that it is an erroneous idea that violent socialistic and communistic ideas are endemic to all large and impoverished bodies of laborers. Poor people may be discontented; but their poverty alone does not make them dangerous. They become dangerous only when the discontent arises from the belief that their case might be relieved, if the governing classes had but the will to do it. The anxiety to overturn the existing order proceeds only from the belief that the miseries of the multitude are not due to the inability of any human agency to destroy suffering and sorrow, but are caused solely by criminal indifference on the part of the government, which might aid, but will not.

There is no need to go any farther into an examination of the several "isms" which unfortunately have acquired such widespread popularity. We have shown their common anatomy, have furnished the key, so to speak, which enables us to decipher them all. The abolition of supernatural religion, which is equivalent to the abolition of God, notwithstanding its inherent and immense absurdity, engenders and logically produces the perilous, pernicious theories of our times. And the gravity of the political and social situation is, therefore, directly traceable to the "creed of the nineteenth century," from which we have found that the destructive tendencies of modern society logically result. The storehouse of human society contains a vast amount of inflammable material; a



single spark thrown into it may cause a huge conflagration. The question now is, will the fermenting mass of humanity have long to wait for a pretext, to inaugurate a general movement for the destruction of authority?

The several governments of Europe are already seriously addressing themselves to the task of averting it. They are trying to remove the inflammable and explosive materials and to acquire absolute control over the unruly elements that have accumulated to an alarming extent in the ranks of the masses.

We turn, therefore, from the contemplation of the evils which are menacing society to the contemplation of the forces which are engaged in eradicating those evils.

What are the duties and obligations of governments? How do the governments of to-day acquit themselves of these duties and obligations? Are the principles of modern governments in harmony with the immutable principles which the philosophy of history inculcates as indispensable conditions of order, of power, and of stability? These are grave questions and they challenge attention, if the foreshadowings of the future in the present are more than mere idle conjectures. In order to answer these questions we must make a diversion into the past and ask: Has history a law? In other words, are the events which make up history really connected with each other, and are they in their causative principles the combined action of a Divine Providence and of human liberty, —or are they a conglomeration of facts that reproduce themselves haphazard in time and space?

Now history is certainly not an aimless, purposeless movement, nor a mere mechanical ceaseless surging to and fro of human atoms; on the contrary it is full of life and of intelligent purpose. It is a movement born, which will one day reach its end, but which, *en route* and in proportion as it advances, indicates to us the past and foreshadows the future—what has been and what will be. It is a witness and at the same time a prophet; and, therefore, it is an un failing source of instruction, for religion itself forms part of it. If we search all ages, from earliest antiquity down to the beginning of the Christian era, and continuing from there through nineteen hundred years to our own days, we find that man at all times has been confronted by the same mysteries which now confront him. Whence do we come? Where do we go? What is our destiny? These mysterious problems in all ages have clamored for solution, and in all ages religion has found it her special province to satisfy man on these all-important points. Hence it is that, whenever and wherever in history man is encountered, it is always as a religious being; for what is religion, but the expression by the human race of its innate consciousness of dependence upon a Supreme Being?

Proudhon, in *The Confessions of a Revolutionist*, has the following sentence: "It is surprising to observe how we find all our political questions complicated with theological questions."

This, however, is not surprising to one who knows from history that religion in all ages has been regarded as the indestructible foundation of human society. Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, the master-minds of Greece, hold with Cicero, Cato, and Plutarch the belief "that it is easier to build a city in the air than to establish human society without belief in God." Their opinion stands not alone, and we select almost at random from the works of Rousseau, and even of Voltaire, passages confirming the opinion. The former observes "that a state never was founded without religion as its basis." The latter says, "that religion on all accounts is necessary wherever human society exists." We conclude, therefore, on the unanimous testimony of all ages, that one of the main functions of the State consists in protecting and fostering religion.

Apart, however, from the cumulative evidence of history, the duty of any government to defend and uphold religion among its subjects results also from an analysis of the purpose and object of government; and, moreover, as we shall see, it is not an optional or accidental function, but an obligatory and essential duty from which there can be no exemption. If it is conceded that human society constitutes what is called the social order, and again, that the social order is the proper sphere of political science, then it is evidently the office of the State to establish and maintain those conditions under which society alone can prosper and move forward on the road towards self-perfection. The social order, in its turn, is made up of individuals, and the individuals, finally, are composed of body and soul. On account of this dual nature, and the constant conflict between the two elements, the predominance of the spiritual over the animal part of human nature is not only desirable but necessary in the individual, for only thereby can the animal passions and desires be kept within due bounds. And, since man as a member of the social order, retains what he possesses as individual, the same necessity which exists in the individual, must recur in a multitude of individuals, that is, in human society, in the social order. And hence arises the task of the State to pay due attention to this dual composition of human nature, that the correct equilibrium between the two constituents may be preserved. Hence the necessity of a Church as well, as of a State, a duality which corresponds to the dual nature of man. The more the State promotes the elevation of the spiritual nature, the more efficient the State becomes; for, an increase of virtue and a diminution of vice invariably raise the standard of morality, and that again is the work of religion. The most religious States present themselves, therefore,



to us as the most durable in point of time. This is in perfect harmony with reason, and is so amply verified by fact, that no room for doubt is left. In times gone by, the greater or less amount of success with which governments fulfilled this paramount duty to society, determined alike their prosperity and their longevity, and the same law holds good to-day. It will greatly facilitate our insight into the principles of modern governments, if we glance cursorily at the successive stages through which they passed before they became what they now are.

Two facts strike us with peculiar force when we take a retrospect of the condition of mankind in pre-Christian times. The one is that, through the whole complicated network of superstition that enveloped the Gentile world, there runs one legend like a silver thread; it appears and reappears in many different versions, yet fundamentally it is one: the tradition of man's creation, his fall and punishment, and the necessity of a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the outraged majesty of the Infinite. The other fact is, that the amount of knowledge originally possessed by the human race in regard to the primitive universal tradition became, as time advanced, obscured. The oldest religions are more Christian, so to speak, than those nearer to our era in point of time. The pre-Christian ages record a steady retrogression, instead of a continuous progress in that respect, and the greatest amount of moral and spiritual darkness prevailed at that very time when Christianity began to shed its light from heaven upon the utterly distorted and fragmentary notions of the original common legend, which were all that mankind had succeeded in preserving. Christianity confirmed not only the tradition of the creation and the fall of man, but it explained the first transgression in a clear and definite way, pointed out and described the indelible traces which it had left behind, namely, the disposition of the creature to revolt against the Creator; and Christianity did not stop there, it furnished also the means by which the tendency of man towards evil might be successfully overcome. The human race, rescued from barbarism by Christianity, has now passed in its onward march through nineteen centuries. Has this long period been one of uninterrupted progress? No, it has not. The paradoxical phenomenon that man is a religious creature, so much so that it is utterly impossible to entirely eradicate belief of some sort from his heart, be it merely the agnostic formula: *something is*; and that man, at the same time struggles incessantly to free himself from the chains which his belief creates for him,—this paradoxical phenomenon has found expression time and again during the Christian era in desperate conflicts. Yet all the events which may properly be comprised in that category up to the closing of mediæval history, may be designated as transitory rather than as lasting evidences of the perversity

of human nature. The first movement on a gigantic scale to set up the infinitesimal spark of human intelligence as a most worshipful deity, is the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century. At no time previous did there exist a more powerful and more favorable combination of conditions to give a revolt of man against his Maker a wide range within a short time. The fall of Constantinople, and, subsequent to it, the scattering of the accumulated literary treasures of Greece and Rome, disseminated the ideas and culture of Paganism; the discovery of a new continent roused the dormant energies of the maritime nations of Europe, and the invention of printing gave a fresh impetus to its intellectual life. The Reformation, in creating Protestantism, has theoretically affirmed religion and its necessity, but practically it has denied both. For it is impossible to assert that Protestantism did *not* establish the principle of private judgment, and the latter, dissolved into its essence, is the virtual dethronement of God and enthronement of human reason in His place. God ceases to be authority, when each individual's judgment becomes final authority, and a religion without God as authority for its decrees, scarcely deserves the name of religion. De Tocqueville remarks that the human mind, left to follow its own bent, will regulate the temporal and spiritual institutions of society upon one uniform basis, namely, man endeavors to harmonize the state in which he lives on earth with the state he believes awaits him after death? No religion has arisen since the Reformation which is not in juxtaposition to a political opinion, connected with it by affinity. For more than three hundred years Protestantism, because it is a system without any cohesive power, has split up into an endless multitude of sects, undisturbed, nay unconcerned, even, about the results to which it finally and legitimately leads. The French Revolution of '89 presents to us the first tangible consequence of the enthronement of the cultus of reason, alias private judgment. And in the saturation of the masses with revolutionary ideas lies, as we have pointed out before, the danger of the future.

The change produced by the Reformation in the tone and character of the social order, has been accompanied by corresponding changes in the governments. The mediæval monarchy disappeared. The sovereignty was transferred from the monarch to the nation, and the "sovereign (*supreme*) will of the people" was proclaimed as the original source of authority, *par excellence*. Almost every form of government now rests upon that principle; yet "the will of the nation" is one of those expressions which have been most extensively employed by the wily and the despotic, to render the principle itself barren, and under it to conceal absolutism. Nevertheless, the constitutional monarchies, as well as the republican governments of our times, rest alike on this basis.



There was a time since the Reformation during which the ruler of a country reigned himself and in his own pretended right, and we can point to no more emphatic illustration than the "*cujus regio, illius religio*" of that period. The process of disintegration was slow. By degrees the prerogatives of emperor and king were shorn of all vital elements, either by direct pressure or by way of compromise. The monarchical principle has receded before the democratic principle, and the masses have gradually secured a participation in the framing of laws and the decision of national questions. Again, the very essence of democratic governments rests in the principle of the absolute sovereignty of the majority. The moral power of the majority is founded upon the theory that the interests of the many are to be preferred to those of the few, and the legislatures of all existing governments are now swayed by the wishes of the majority. Thus ministries rise and fall through parliamentary majorities and minorities. Nor has the spirit of the age which thus finds expression in mere majorities, failed to impress its distinctive character upon the decrees which issue from the legislative assemblies. In almost all countries the contrast between the liberal and conservative parties has been decided in favor of the latter. A slight examination of the laws which have emanated from parliaments representing modern ideas, strongly tinged with atheism and antagonistic to all true religion, is sufficient to prove that the "*cultus of reason*" reigns supreme in the world to-day. The spirit of the age manifests its ascendancy in wholly emancipating the State from the Church. The measures taken for that purpose tend in their intrinsic nature not so much to effect a complete separation of Church and State, and to assign to each a definite sphere, as rather to make the Church subservient to the purposes of the State. In other words, the natural and legitimate order of things is reversed, and the temporal order declared to be above the spiritual order. Practically the emancipation of Church and State amounts to this: the first and paramount duty of every human being is not to the Creator, but to the State; man must be a citizen first; afterwards, as a being endowed with a soul, he may think, if he chooses, of his Maker.

Another *reform* which the spirit of the age saw fit to bestow upon society as a genuine benefit and a decided advance in the right direction, is the introduction of "*civil marriage*." We do not gainsay its perfect harmony with the subjugation of the spiritual to the temporal order, and we are ready to concede likewise its accordance with the idea, that the State must provide for the greatest happiness (after humanitarian fashion) of the greatest number. We do not wish to call in question that the conjugal relations between husband and wife are in very many instances far from happy, and from this standpoint the indissolubility of marriage seems, indeed, a de-

cided obstacle to the happiness of many a "citizen;" so, its abolition was decreed, and a door of relief opened in the easy possibility of divorce. Civil marriage is, in our opinion, a subject about which the less said the better. It inculcates impliedly the doctrine that the matrimonial state serves, after all, only for the gratification of the animal passions of human nature, and if deprived of the sanctity and of the inviolable character with which religion surrounds it, it sinks necessarily to an unchecked and unbridled satisfaction of the lowest of all passions, until the animalism of nature, exhausted, breaks down. The amazing rate at which business in divorce courts increases, the facility with which man and wife can sever their relations on account of incompatibility of temper, finally, the number of trials for polygamy before courts of law, are proofs how the "beneficial institution of civil marriage" is understood and interpreted. If civil marriage does not practically legalize concubinage, what, we may well ask, does it, or will it do? If civil marriage does not undermine the foundation of human society, the family, what will do it?

But the climax of how far the much-boasted enlightenment of the nineteenth century goes, is not yet reached. To reach it we must turn to the question of education. If a child grows up under the parental roof and acquires there the bigoted prejudices and the hateful superstition of his parents, instead of the great boon of independent free-thought, this child is less likely to become a modern "ideal citizen" than another child into whose bosom no erroneous superstitions about religion have ever been planted. It seemed, therefore, necessary in order to raise the intellectual standard of human society, to make education secular and compulsory. Religion as a branch of education in public schools has been simply left out, and that fact alone speaks volumes as to what importance the modern State attaches to religion. In several European countries a fierce battle is going on, with strong probabilities that the final decision will be in favor of the most *liberal* views. Religion is thereby virtually declared to be no longer a necessity for man.

What spectacle does Germany present in our day? Has the German Empire openly discarded religion? Oh, no! it is, on the contrary, a sincere advocate of religion, only it must not be the antiquated article, but *modern* religion. Many religious professions have been shaped under the influence of modern thought. On a close analysis they present hardly any claim to the name religion; for, with admirable liberality, they scatter broadcast the principles of atheism. Against these creeds the German Empire is not engaged in warfare. The German Chancellor is not guilty of having made the mistake of undertaking to suppress these, since they are powerful instrumentalities for promoting the purposes of the State.



But positive religion and its practice has been put under restrictions which amount to positive prohibition, and Catholicity is driven with relentless arm out of the German commonwealth. The Falk laws were hailed as the solution of a problem which had almost defied solution. And now what are these laws? What do they virtually promulgate? They embody and proclaim the deification of the State. The final arbiter between man and God is the Minister of Public Worship. Catholicity is openly declared an institution inimical to the State, opposed to all scientific progress, discouraging society from the free use of the intellect; an institution, therefore, for which there is no place in the ideal modern State. Whether the Minister of Public Worship is an inspired personage or not, has not been defined, it is true; but he is for all practical purposes an infallible oracle, and in order to be an exemplary citizen, and consequently, also, an exemplary modern Christian, it is only necessary to obey his injunctions. The German people must dismiss, henceforth, the absurd idea that what is right and wrong in the eyes of the Most High may not tally with what is declared right and wrong by the Ministry of Public Worship, guided and supported by the Falk laws. The wisdom of the Chancellor of Germany discovered only of late that the conception of the idea to devote one's life absolutely to charity is an aberration of the human intellect, and that it is, therefore, an obligation on the part of the government to prevent persons from giving way to such a frenzy. Hence it is that the Sister of Charity no longer dares devote her life to the alleviation of suffering within the precincts of the Empire. The noble Sisters whose gentle and tender hands nursed the sick and tenderly cared for the infirm and friendless, dare no longer perform those offices. They are no longer allowed to whisper words of comfort and consolation into the ears of the dying; to offer up their prayers for them and receive, perhaps with the last breath, the departing soul's last thank-offering.

It is in vain that we try to persuade ourselves that Germany is not in so forlorn a condition; for what we have said is borne out by facts. The authority of the State prescribes to man what he is to think and to believe and to do. The morality sanctioned by the State is the morality which it is the duty of human society to cultivate; the faith sanctioned by the State the only faith which individuals can adhere to with impunity. Life itself and all its cares and labors, all its joys and sufferings, are henceforth to be a free offering to the State. Man's destiny is to contribute his share to the purpose of the State by a complete resignation of his double nature. Man's greatest pride must be to be instrumental in perpetuating the State by his self-immolation, and man's greatest felicity must consist in the consciousness that thereby he procures,

not only for his own self, but also for his age and for posterity, the greatest attainable happiness for time, regardless of eternity. The State is at once father, and mother, and husband, and wife; and it extends in inimitable loving-kindness the benefit of a protective tutelage even over the child. The State relieves the citizen from the onerous burden of making out of the boy an honest, upright, industrious and pious man. The ruling principle in Germany is the deification of the State, and the German Chancellor employs and enforces it, unquestionably, with equal dexterity, firmness, and determination.

We turn now to France. The programme of the French Radicals, under M. Gambetta's leadership, is distinguished by genuine French candor. M. Gambetta has openly declared that he means "war against clericalism," and he has, moreover, for our benefit defined what he understands by "clericalism." It is not only the priest of the Church of Rome; it is belief in a supernatural order and its influence upon civil society. Faith in a Supreme Being and in a world to come, like a pestilence, must be exterminated. The sooner man is freed from that pernicious superstition the brighter the crown of glory to those who accomplish the result. The radicals succeeded in shortening the fast-expiring term of the soldier-president, whose honesty no one ever dared to question. M. Grévy succeeded MacMahon as President of the French Republic. It was a rapid change, and the world is pleased with it for two reasons. First, because it was effected without bloodshed, barricades, and revolution—not unfrequent companions of government experiments in France,—and again, because it promises a prolongation of the *status quo* for another seven years. What the result of the transition from conservative to radical views will be, it is impossible to predict. No nation is more volatile, more excitable, more easily led by the impulse of the moment, than the French nation. No nation, therefore, is more unfitted for a republican form of government, which demands decentralization of power, while in France a centralization of power will always be a necessity. M. Grévy, as President, was a surprise to France, to Europe, and to the world; and further new surprises may yet be in store in France before the last day of 1879 belongs to the past.

If we continue our tour of inspection, the Liberal parties, under whatever name they appear, in Italy, Austro-Hungary, Belgium, and Spain, breathe everywhere the same spirit. Their principles are similar to those we have described in France and Germany, though the measures enacted by them are tempered seemingly by a greater sense of justice towards the conservative elements. Emancipation of Church and State, civil marriage, and secular education, prove convincingly that the object of modern government is



to subject the spiritual order to the temporal power. The mission of the State is conceived to be the propagation of free-thought; and this is proclaimed in unmistakable language.

We are brought now face to face with the problem which we set out to solve, and are prepared to ask: If governments stifle in their subjects by every means at their command belief in a supernatural order; if they remove out of sight the aim which lies beyond the confines of this world; if they loosen the ideas of morality by dissolving and desecrating the sacred bond of marriage; if they engraft upon the multitude the belief that it is irrational to expect any but earthly happiness, does not the State itself virtually and practically teach the very principles from which the crying evils of the day have legitimately sprung? Does not the State by arbitrary measures and with persistent zeal train the people to the acceptance of the "creed of the nineteenth century?" And has the State, therefore, any right to turn round and arraign those whose crime consists in reasoning logically from a basis which the State furnished in the first instance, whose offence is to have drawn correct conclusions from premises which are, after all, only the enforced gift of the State?

If such conduct is not the height of inconsistency, then we must give up forming rational opinions. Yet, incredible as it would be, had we not incontestable evidence for it, State tribunals in our own times have the audacity to condemn and to punish people because they have advanced by a logical process of ratiocination one step further than the ruling classes have done. The forces still at the command of "the powers that be," may still, perhaps, be adequate to withstand a general uprising of the proletariat. But these forces diminish in proportion as the governmental provisions begin to bear fruit. The time when both will be equally matched and when the greater strength will pass over to the masses is certain to come; it is coming with giant strides. What will the contest be? It will be, authority without power arrayed against power without authority. This is simply what we must expect. It is in vain that the governments of our day try to fasten the responsibility of the impending calamity on other shoulders than their own; for the fault lies with them. Were the monstrous "isms" not already in existence, it could safely be predicted, and that with absolute certainty, that they would be generated ere long by the doctrines which are nurtured and fostered and spread by the modern State. Fanatics always did exist and always will exist, and fanatics always have had and always will have fanatical followers. It is not isolated individual fanatics, however, who cause the gravity of the present situation, but the formidable league of organized political associations, working under the dictation of the "Internationale."

Since existing governments are destitute of those elements which alone furnish a guarantee of stability, and since the modern State is incapacitated, by the very principles of its polity, from staying the advance of revolution, it is impossible for us to look forward with cheerfulness to the future. How can we, on the eve of a crisis, prognosticate simply a transitory disturbance, when every indication along the horizon betokens a terrible cyclone? The preponderance of the destructive over the reconstructive elements in the composition of the social order is so overwhelming that no rays of light seem to enter into the portents of the future. No decree, though it were enforced with the iron energy and indomitable determination which characterize the German Chancellor, no parliamentary measure, though it were passed without one voice dissenting, nothing, in short, which the modern State can devise, will be able either to check the advance or to exterminate the existence of the sinister forces, whose avowed object consists in overturning the existing order of things. The proper balance between the temporal and the spiritual authority has been disturbed, and daily it is being still more and more disturbed by the modern State. It is the aim and the boast of the nineteenth century to eliminate religion from society; and now the work, though incomplete and imperfect, already makes the governments tremble. When infuriated mobs of countless numbers shall meet authorities impotent to offer any resistance, these latter will succumb only to arms, which they themselves forced into the hands of their assailants; they will be beaten with weapons of their own manufacture, and by men of their own forming and training. The spirit of the age has proved powerful to destroy, but now proves powerless to rebuild. The State could dethrone religion, but the State cannot enthrone it again. The proper relations between body and soul, between the temporal and the spiritual order, must be re-established, and to each must be assigned again its right place in the individual, in society, and in the State. The State, as we have seen, is unable in its present condition to perform this office.

The only remedy for this state of things, the power which alone can avert the impending catastrophe, is religion. Religion alone can preserve and reconstruct the social order on a basis which will be durable, and contain at the same time in its very essence the elements of prosperity and stability. Man must be restored again to faith; he must be taught to look forward beyond this life, instead of fixing his gaze stolidly on the ground; he must be made again to know that all inequalities of this world will be redressed in the next; he must live again for that realm where there is neither suffering nor death; he must understand again that authority derives its title from God, and ascends in a sublime hierarchy from the father



to the king, from the king to the pontiff, from the pontiff to Him, who is both our Creator and Redeemer, our Judge and our Benefactor. The family must again become the nucleus of happiness, and marriage a holy union, on the altar of which man offers up a threefold sacrifice in his threefold capacity—one to God, by a life of purity and love, one to the human family, by propagating the race, one to the State, by educating his offspring into citizens upon which he and the State may look with honorable pride. It is entirely useless to expect a cure of the present social pestilence from any other source than that which it has pleased Divine Providence, through the advent of our Saviour, to institute for that purpose, namely, the Church.

How erroneous it is to regard the Catholic religion as the natural enemy of progress and civilization, and hence of modern governments, whereas, in truth, it is the one religion of all that is most favorable to an equality of condition, is admirably told by De Tocqueville. He says:

“On doctrinal points the Catholic faith places all human capacities upon the same level; it subjects the wise and the ignorant, the man of genius and the vulgar crowd, to the details of the same creed; it imposes the same observances upon the rich and the needy; it inflicts the same austerities upon the strong and the weak; it listens to no compromise with mortal man, but subjecting all the human race to the same standard, it confounds all distinctions of society at the foot of the same altar, even as they are confounded in the sight of God.”

We have said that it is the mission of the Catholic Church to hasten to the succor of man and of society in his and its greatest stress. And already the voice of the successor of Him, who brought the light of Christianity down from heaven, has sounded. In the Encyclical of December, 1878, Pope Leo XIII., after dwelling upon the grave outlook, and then vividly depicting the dangers that encompass human society, in a spirit of charity, and yet of dignified, undaunted courage, points out the road which prince and statesman, nation and family, the aggregated people and the individual must alike pursue, if they desire to avoid total shipwreck.

Whether the political outlook will remain dark and cheerless, as at present, or become brighter, as is to be hoped, will depend, therefore, upon whether existing governments will, or will not, heed the voice which has spoken to them. If they continue to display that arrogance and indifference which is the temper of the modern mind, whether in states or individuals, towards the utterances of the Sovereign Pontiff; if they turn away from that power which, in their folly and frenzy, they have tried to crush, but failed, as fail they ever must in like attempts, for it is a power divine and invulnerable, possessed of a life which is inextinguishable because eternal; if they persist in their wicked, impious folly, then the

most calamitous social eruption the world has yet beheld seems certain to overwhelm Europe. But if the governments and peoples of Europe will listen to and return to her who, though calumniated and persecuted, in superhuman charity extends her helping hand to her persecutors in distress, then we may expect relief. Reason and history, both tell us that in the Church alone dwells the power to restore the equilibrium in the dual nature of individual man, which the presence of sin has destroyed; and so, too, by necessary consequence, in human society and in the State. For, nineteen hundred years ago voices of angels gave warning to all times to come that "Glory to God in the Highest" is a necessary condition, precedent and concomitant, to "peace on earth."

---

## CATHOLIC SOCIETIES.

BY Catholic Societies we mean those bodies of Catholics who are united together for some purpose more or less relating to religion or morality, and under the guidance and approval of the Church, an approval ordinarily signified by the presence of their chaplain. Not every association of Catholics, therefore, is a Catholic society, otherwise any banking company, composed exclusively of Catholic business men, should be called a Catholic society or association. We are aware that this is sometimes done; but with bad taste, and with more or less harm to religion, often made responsible in this way for the shortcomings of individuals. We remember once reading some sharp remarks of the *New York Herald*, venting its spleen against some one by styling him "*a professional Catholic*." It was wickedly witty. But our enemies sometimes shoot these remarks at us, not without a certain spice of truth in them. And it is to be hoped that the abuse of the word Catholic, for business or other purposes not religious, will be confined to the narrowest limits compatible with human frailty. In his late Encyclical our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., recognizing the existence of societies as a special feature of this age, and deploring the evil influences under which societies generally are, which with truthful appreciation he points out, recommends as an antidote for the children of the Church, the formation of other



similar societies among laymen under the guidance of religion. His words are: "It seems fitting that societies of artisans and workmen be encouraged, which, placed under the guardianship of religion, may make their members content with their lot, patient under their burdens, and lead them to live a quiet and tranquil life."

The question, therefore, is not whether we should have societies, a question already practically settled, and now officially settled by the sovereign Pontiff; but how are our societies to be constituted; how are they to be organized; what are the dangers they are to guard against; how are they to stand in relation to the Church; how far is the Church to wield her influence over them; how far are they to be allowed to take their part in solving the labor questions of the day;—all these are very important questions, which we shall strive to answer after we shall first have treated of Societies in general, and the relation of the Church to them in the past.

The spirit of association is in man in virtue of his very nature. Once the inhabitants of the earth became numerous, and the ties of the one family became loosened, common interest formed men into nations, and varied interests common to a number had the effect of making this number cling together, and constitute a body united together by common customs. The remains of antiquity that have come down to us tell us of the existence of colleges of those whose pursuits were similar; the well-known college of bakers of ancient Rome, for example, and the guilds of the Middle Ages are only another confirmation of this tendency of human nature. The Church, whose office is not to pervert human nature but to foster it, with her characteristic prudence took these associations under her protection and guided them in the right path, except where her influence was set at naught by the passions of men. She was herself one vast society, and the experience she had gained by centuries of experience was placed at their disposal. Even at the early period of her struggles she had within her these colleges, and in the catacombs are to be seen the representation of the *fossores*, or guardians of her cemeteries, allusions to coopers and to other tradesmen. Acting under the guidance of the Spirit dwelling in her she formed the most perfect of colleges—the Religious Order, realizing what the Tusculan philosopher had written: *Omnium societatum nulla præstantior est, nulla firmior, quam cum viri boni moribus similes sunt familiaritate conjuncti.* Off., lib. I.

We see, therefore, the Church, given by God to govern and direct the moral order of society, taking the association of laymen under her ægis, laying down for them laws, endowing them with privileges and giving them a canonical status, which made them

respectable; securing also for them a legal entity, she conferred importance on them, giving them a legal power which checked the daring of the feudal lord who chanced to be a tyrant.

But if they were made what they became by the power and widespread influence of the Church, she did not give them full sway to do as they listed. On the contrary she curbed them by salutary restraints. From time to time it would happen that they forgot themselves, and asserted their independence of their local ecclesiastical superior. Then would come the appeal to the central authority of the Church, and the decision reasserting the power of the bishop. There are some of these decisions on record, which as interesting exemplifications of what we have said we introduce here.

It must be remarked that these societies came to be known as Confraternities, and were instituted for all kinds of purposes, all more or less connected with religious exercises. Thus there existed at Lanciano, in Italy, a society or Confraternity, known as the society for taking care of the dead. These good people came into conflict with their archbishop, and the case went to Rome. They didn't want him to have anything to do with the election of their officers, and much less did they desire him to look into their accounts; and if he did, they wanted the work done through men of their own choosing. The Sacred Congregation of the Council, on the 20th of September, 1710, decreed, after mature deliberation: 1st, that they must proceed with their election in the presence of the vicar-general, as commanded by the archbishop; 2dly, that an election made otherwise was invalid; 3dly, that the election of the officers required for its validity the confirmation of the archbishop; 4thly, that the society must give an account of its funds and expenses to the archbishop; 5thly, that the archbishop could make use of his own agents, and was not bound to make use of those chosen by the members.

There was another society at Offida, near Ascoli, in Italy. They were also a body of men who, in like manner as the above, had as their special object to pray for the dead. They had their legal and canonical status. They differed with their bishop, and the case went to Rome. Like those just spoken of they tried to keep the bishop from having anything to do with their elections, and from auditing their accounts. The same Sacred Congregation of the Council, on the 3d and 24th of March, 1725, decreed, in answer, that the bishop, personally or by deputy, could be present at the elections; that he could remove the officers who were unfit for their place; and that the society was bound to give an account of their pecuniary administration to the bishop. It is of no use to



multiply instances. These are enough to show the spirit of the Church, and her mode of dealing with such societies.

The societies we have nowadays are of two kinds; one is the Confraternity as described above; the other is the society which has no recognized legal or canonical status, but which consists of laymen united together under the patronage of the Church for some beneficial purpose. They are societies for mutual aid; and that aid, according to the scope to which it tends, generally gives the name to the organization.

It is of these latter societies that we shall now specially speak, as they are those which have arisen from the circumstances of our time, the outcome of the vicissitudes of the nineteenth century.

It may prove a useful guide to us at the outset to remember that these Catholic Societies have been rendered necessary by the secret societies that have overspread the nations of the earth. They have been constituted as it were in self defence. The manner, therefore, in which secret societies have been constituted will to some extent give us a clue as to the constitution of our Catholic societies.

It is no secret that the so-called secret societies here in America are in great part merely beneficial associations, for mutual aid in sickness or distress, and especially for the advancement of business relations. That some of them, if not all, have affiliations with the secret societies of Europe, societies political and rationalistic, as well as beneficial, is a fact known to us; for we have had it from the mouth of those who, not understanding the languages of the countries through which they were journeying in Europe, found, in spite of that, the sign-manual a passport, and a command obeyed with alacrity. Their principal feature, however, here, besides their secrecy and strange forms, or rituals, is the business and beneficial feature.

From these societies, Catholics are necessarily excluded by the circumstances of the case. The oath of secrecy, and the false principles which are the basis of these societies, sapping the foundation of religion and government, have long since, as we all know, made the sovereign authority of the Church condemn them formally. The exclusion in this way of Catholics makes them look around in self-defence for means of protection. The movement is general, and we should regard it with favor. Our Catholics should band together, come to each other's assistance, and give that mutual aid and comfort and even business help, denied them by the other social combinations of the day; for it is an undeniable fact that unless a man belong to some secret trades-union, he will hardly be able to find employment. We are the last person to wish to array our fellow-Catholics against our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, to whom we acknowledge ourselves sincerely attached. But

when we behold them acting as they do, and treating worthy men and faithful citizens with disregard, and neglect, and ostracism, because they are conscientious, then we say the time has come not to array ourselves in a hostile manner against our countrymen, but to band ourselves together in self-defence; then we say the time has come for us to stretch out our hands to each other, to employ each other, to favor each other, to form societies for mutual aid, and for mutual benefit in sickness or distress, and to further each other's business relations, to secure insurance of property or life, in a word to form the counterpart of the associations from which the laws of the Church exclude us, but without their objectionable features, and in a spirit of charity which will contrast to advantage with the spirit that animates them, and therefore not to the exclusion from employment of non-Catholics, who of course are not members of our societies.

Our societies thus constituted as to their general form are to be organized on the basis of religion. The Church which is given us by God to guide us, which is God working in the midst of mankind, is our only sure corner-stone, and anything standing without her is sure to fall. We want our societies to last, to prosper, and to do a real good work. The only thing then to be done is to make God's Church, first and last, the foundation and the binding power of our fabric. The way to do this is to take as our standard the decisions and openly declared principles of the Church, to make respect for her authority paramount, to resolve that a word from her will make us give up any cherished plan; and all this must be from the deepseated conviction of our faith, looking on all authority, and especially the authority of the Church, as of God. Here, again, the principles that are the basis of the secret societies in general will serve as an indication to us, telling us what principles held and taught by the Church are to be those especially held as guides for our Catholic societies. We find these societies standing on a selfish principle. They seek themselves at the expense of society, for they disregard the essential safeguard of society, authority, when they deem their interests require it. The history of these associations, if not here, certainly in Europe, is one of plotting against government, of thwarting of justice, of violation of trust, of violence, bloodshed, and even secret assassination. How far anything of this kind takes place here we will not go on to say. We know that the excesses of Europe have not, thus far, been imitated here; but that there is imitation to some extent of the blamable features of European secret societies in this country, is true. We shall only mention one fact to show we are not speaking wildly. A friend of ours was passing the night with a family that had given him hospitality in his journeying. The members of the family were



all together talking with our friend, in saddened tones, of one of their number, who had led a bad life and, as a result, had killed a man, and was to suffer the penalty of the law by hanging on the following day. While they were yet talking, there was a rap at the door. It was opened, and who should walk in but the condemned man himself. For a moment all were breathless; but when a near relative found words to ask him, how it was he escaped from prison, his answer was: "Had I not been a Freemason, it would have been all up with me."

It is unlawful to thwart justice; and therefore such an act as the above could not be tolerated one moment among conscientious Catholics, and could not be the act of a Catholic Society, whose blazon must be *respect for authority*. In fact, this spirit of obedience and respect, and, what is more, love for authority, is a special characteristic of the True Religion. For God is the Author of all things, and the Author of all authority. He Himself is Authority itself, and any created authority is but a participation of that authority which is essentially in Him. In the same way we owe to that primal essential authority, God Himself, obedience, respect, and love, so do we owe to the created participation of it a proportionate degree of obedience, respect, and love. This is the reason why the Catholic should set himself against that spirit born of Protestantism, private judgment and self-assertion, which leads men to condemn authority, to look on it with jealousy as an enemy, and to cherish unkindly feelings towards those that exercise it, even though they exercise it justly. Catholics, on the contrary, must follow the advice of the Apostle, obey cheerfully, and from conscience, that those ruling them may discharge their onerous duties in joy, and not in sorrow.

Another dangerous principle against which Catholic Societies must guard, and with regard to which they will find the Church guiding them in the right way, is the levelling tendency of the day. If any one will take up the preamble of some of the trades-unions, he will find therein more or less of socialistic theory—the arraying of the working classes against the moneyed class; and it may be that he will find the condition that when a member becomes an employer, he must cease to be a member. He becomes one of the hostile class. Certainly this state of things is not Christian. We are not going to censure unduly the working class; we feel more disposed in our heart to censure the wealthy class, whose grasping at wealth has brought about this uprising against them. But undeniably both classes are wrong. Each has ignored the other; each disregards the rights of the other. As the Sovereign Pontiff, in the Encyclical, *Quod apostolici muneris*, beautifully and learnedly writes: "Catholic wisdom, taking its stand on the precepts

of natural and divine law, has with great forethought provided for public and domestic tranquillity by means of what she believes and teaches with regard to the right of dominion, or of property, and the division of those possessions which have been gotten together for the wants and uses of life. For, while socialists traduce the right of property as an invention of man, repugnant to natural equality; and, affecting a community of goods, think that poverty is not to be borne with equanimity, but that the possessions and rights of the wealthy can be violated with impunity; the Church with more propriety and utility recognizes among men, differing naturally in the strength of their body and intellect, inequality also in the possession of property; and requires that the right of property and dominion, which is from nature itself, be for every one sacred from the hands of others and inviolate."

How true is this! One man is born almost an idiot, another with talent; will the career of these two be the same, their success the same? One man has health, the other is a cripple; will these two be equal in the results of their physical labor? One man has given him the advantages of education, and culture, and experience; the other's lot is ignorance and neglect; will their social position and influence be the same? The socialists themselves know it is their men of education that lead them; they follow.

There is no such thing as universal equality. It is a figment of the wild brain of the agitator, coquetting with the ignorance of the mass of mankind! We are equal in this, that God loves us all, wishes us all to be saved, and will judge us all according to our works, without respect of persons. We are said to be equal before the laws of our country. Beyond this, there is and can be no equality, unless you change nature, which even the Socialists will not pretend they have the power of doing.

The first duty, therefore, of a Catholic Society, after recognizing the right of God to our obedience, is to recognize the rights of one's neighbor, the right of property, the right to liberty undisturbed by interference of others, the right to social position, the right to influence and reputation honestly gained by talent, industry, and good conduct, the right of each one to lead a life of tranquillity and happiness; in a word, the rule of charity which does unto others as we should wish them to do unto us—this is to be the principle of action among Catholic Societies. We are to respect inviolably the rights of others as we look to having our own respected. If the Catholics who compose these Societies of ours will take care to follow the decisions and teaching of their Church, they will have an unerring rule, by which to discharge this great and imperative duty; while by doing so they will show themselves to be the salt of the earth.



How are Catholic Societies to stand in relation to the Church, is a point which may receive a different answer, according to the way in which one understands the question. We simply say, first, that every one in the Church is subject to the higher powers in it, in all that relates to spiritual matters; secondly, that in what is temporal, it would seem advisable that the liberty of administering their own affairs should be interfered with as little as possible by Church authority. But they should always cherish a loyal and submissive spirit towards the Church, God's Representative on earth. How far the Church should wield her influence over them is a delicate question. But when we consider that she is given us from above as the guide to truth, there can be no other opinion but that, as the influence of the Church should penetrate our whole life and influence every action of ours, in accordance with the great expression of St. Paul, "The just man liveth by faith;" so this influence should be felt in the same manner in every Catholic body of men. This influence should be represented in them by their chaplain, who, if for no other reason, should be there to keep the members from being indoctrinated with the false notions of to-day, so easily taken up from the newspapers, even so-called Catholic newspapers, from the workshop, and from the example and principles of men of like avocations, banded together in secret organization. We consider this of the very first importance; for it cannot be denied that not a few Catholics of the lower walks of life have imbibed socialistic principles to a greater or less extent. They have forgotten their Catechism, and are learning the catechism of the secret societies.

There remains one point more to be dwelt on,—how far any Catholic Society can be permitted to take part in meeting the labor questions of the day. The matter is a very extensive one, and we do not pretend to exhaust it in a few words. Still, certain principles can be laid down that are very important. The labor question, as understood by those who generally speak of it, is the question not of finding work, for the demand regulates the supply, but the struggle between employers and employed. It is carried on by the trades-unions on the one side and capitalists on the other. The action of the union is ordinarily despotic. They settle the question of strikes, and how much is to be asked as wages. If capitalists always gave fair wages, we may confidently say there would be no need of such associations with such an aim. But it is notorious that greed of wealth does not often allow capitalists to be generous or even just. Hence the poor hardworking man seeks support in combinations and in his numbers. The order given must be carried out; the strike is ordered, and woe to the man who will not take part in it. What is worse, if any one presumes to work in

spite of the prohibition, he is made to understand that he must desist on pain of risk to life or limb, and the threat is very often carried out.

We suppose the existence of a Catholic trades-union, for our ordinary Societies have nothing to do with this question; their scope lies in a different direction. Obviously, a Catholic Society could not countenance active interference with the rights of others; it could not take the law into its own hands; it could not foster sedition, destruction of property, violence and bloodshed. There is one right, however, the members have, and which they could not be denied the use of. As they can hire out their labor, so if they do not think the remuneration sufficient, they can refuse to work singly, or in a body. They can use all lawful means to gain their point; but they cannot go further. But even this exercise of right might be in abeyance, owing to the danger of civil discord that might arise; and it should, therefore, be used with moderation. We apprehend that among Catholics, who are not so only in name, such a state of tension would be next to impossible; for charity on the part of the employer, and reason on the part of the workman, would settle the matter at once, or prevent its coming up. Still, the conflict is possible, and the men have their right to labor or not as they wish; but, as we have said, no right beyond what the law of God, and the law of the land when not in contradiction with God's law, allow them. They could, therefore, to that extent, and to that extent alone, sympathize with their fellow-workmen and take part in the solution of the question of just remuneration. They would, however, even in this, encounter stumbling-blocks, for they would find that many of the labor associations are led on by men whose principles are Socialistic, and they would for this reason find that many propositions are broached and measures initiated which would not observe the just and natural relations of labor and capital. In reality the laborer has no right to a cent more than he has contracted for. He is at liberty not to enter into the contract; once he has done so he must keep his word.

We do not refer to instances of grinding exaction on the part of employers taking advantage of the poverty of their employees. But we speak of those who aspire to get possession of their employer's goods, to have a community of goods. They form their own ideas of how much they ought to have of the profits, and take advantage of their employer's straits to force him to terms. This is what checks industry, and contributes to people the country with tramps. Ordinarily speaking, the daily support of the man himself and of his wife and children, ought to be the least remuneration a good workman should receive; what his wife could



make should go to provide for the future. Skilled labor should, of course, receive proportionately more. Once workmen receive this amount they have no just reason to complain. They should stifle envy, and, to use the words of Pope Leo XIII., learn to live contented with the lot God has given them. What will certainly make the Catholic workman so live is the truth so beautifully announced by the Apostles: we have no permanent citizenship here, but we look for another. We are not here forever; we are journeying to our real country and home, the hereafter; and our status or condition there depends not on worldly wealth or influence, but upon our works done here; so that it is in every man's power to secure for himself a high position and a great degree of glory in his true home. If any man will keep this well before his eyes he will find it a powerful help to make him content with the station of life Providence has allotted him.

We close these few remarks with an observation regarding the importance of our Catholic Societies looking to the Church more than ever for guidance. There never was a period when wilder theories were broached, more extensively circulated, or more read by the people. In our own midst we have hosts of Europeans, many of them clever and well-educated, who were forced to leave their respective countries because of their efforts to overthrow social order. These men have become editors of newspapers, and have been feeding our simpler American population with what they call their advanced ideas, till we hardly recognize the land of our youth. These false ideas in religion and in the social order the Church examined thoroughly where they first arose. She has condemned them, and her condemnation has been met with an acknowledgment that she has spoken truly, but at the same time with a cry of defiance. Let us, therefore, stand to this Church, which has the Spirit of Wisdom from above; let us have as our compass the Syllabus of the great Pius IX.; let us reverently receive and emblazon on our banner the late Encyclical of the learned Leo XIII.

---

THE RELATION OF THE POPES TO LITERATURE,  
PRIOR TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

NO one can deny that the Popes have always been the patrons of theology. It is a science which particularly becomes their state and office as priests and spiritual guides. Consequently there has been little or no attack made on their reputation as advocates of theological science. Nor in view of their countless productions of a theological character, running from the Epistles of St. Peter, the first Pope, down to our own times, through letters of Leo the Great, Homilies of Gregory I., theological works like that of Benedict XIV. on "Diocesan Synods," and the whole array of Bulls, Briefs, and Encyclicals, treating of every dogmatical, moral, ascetical, mystical, canonical, and rubrical subject that has ever been discussed within the last nineteen centuries, and filling scores of ponderous tomes, large and numerous enough to crowd the shelves of spacious libraries, can any one reasonably assert that the Popes have not been the Mæcenases of theological studies. But have they been, at the same time, the patrons of literature? This is a question upon which there has been much discussion. A certain class of writers, not content with blaming them as having been adverse to the progress of the natural sciences, for having imprisoned mathematicians, and subjected astronomers like Galileo to the pains and penalties of the Inquisition, accuse them of general obscurantism, of impeding the progress of art, and of being like so many drags on the chariot-wheels of human intellectual development. According to these writers the Popes have been opposed to poetry, to the drama, to painting, to sculpture, and to music. They have abhorred universal education and detested inventions, especially that of printing, for the reason that they wished to keep the people in ignorance. According to these gentlemen, ignorance and popery are correlative terms. They point to the dark ages for proofs of their theory, especially to those centuries in which, owing to the misfortunes of the times and to lay intrusion in clerical affairs, a few Pontiffs, more like unto Judas than to Peter, disgraced the tiara, while they proved the divinity of the Church by illustrating the fact that she can live in spite of the vices of her rulers or of her children. These scandals of sin and ignorance are taken as proofs that the Popes were unfriendly to literature and to the arts; these spots on the sun are assumed to show that the whole orb is an opaque body.

Now, it is not our purpose, in this article, to refute in detail all



the objections of such enemies of the Papacy; nor do we intend to give all the proofs which might be adduced to show how erroneous is their opinion. We do not mean to go over ground in a special manner, which has been already trodden by the champions of the Popes, to show that they were the friends of the mathematicians as well as of the *littérateurs*; and that the story of Galileo's punishment has been distorted into a calumny against the Roman Church. All these subjects have been exhausted by men like De Maistre, Donoso Cortes, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Auguste Nicolas, Dr. Brownson—a name never to be forgotten by American Catholics—by Cardinal Wiseman, and others, who have left nothing for their successors to investigate or to establish. We wish to restrict ourselves to a special inquiry into what the Popes have done particularly for that branch of the fine arts comprised under the head of Literature or Belles-Lettres, in the ages preceding the eleventh century. The reason for this proceeding is, that the most difficult part of the theme may be made the most manifest. The cathedrals of Europe, with their exquisitely beautiful stained glass windows, built while the Popes enjoyed full sway over the European conscience; the masterpieces of painting and sculpture handed down to us by those favorites of the Popes, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Fra Angelico, Guido Reni, Bernini, and others; easily convince the impartial student that the Popes have been patrons of those arts and of architecture. History tells us that a Popè, Gregory the Great, is the father of plain music in all its forms. He reformed the Ambrosian Chant, which had been used in the Church up to the sixth century. Nor can it be said that the Popes are unfriendly to the full development of the art of music, because of their opposition to the introduction of operatic airs into the choir-singing of the mass. This objection would hold good only in case the reprobation of an abuse, or the preference for a certain mode, of art could be fairly construed into a condemnation of all its modes. No Pope ever condemned operatic music in its own place, nor has any Pope ever condemned the proper *use* of what is called modern music in the Church. The Popes have reprobated abuses of the art of music as they would reprove the nude in statuary or paintings intended for the Church. It is a mistake to infer from the expressed preference of a Pontiff for plain chant, that he necessarily condemns the masses of Mozart or of Haydn. He simply reprove the music of certain church choirs for being as indecent in the sacred edifice as would be the Venus of Milo or the Apollo of Belvidere in the niches around the altar. The Ambrosian Chant and the gay measures in use before Gregory the Great's time were permitted by Pontiffs as holy and learned as himself, and it would be illogical to conclude that he intended to condemn them absolutely, since some of them were mar-

tyrs for the faith, when he reformed the sacred song. Palestrina's reform of music, at the time of the Council of Trent, was also needed; but the papal sanction given to his "*Mass of Pope Marcellus*," did not necessarily exclude further progress in the study of harmony or counterpoint. In disputed cases of this kind, namely, as to the proper kind of music to be used, there is generally some fanaticism on both sides of the question. Those who indiscriminately condemn plain chant, are not more in error than they who would restrict our gorgeous liturgy, which like Joseph's coat is of many colors, to the slavery of any undeveloped and imperfect art. We admit into the Church paintings of the Madonna, from various schools, for there is no papal exclusiveness as to the color or form which must serve as the artist's ideal. The various styles of architecture are equal before the Papal See. The fact that there is but one Gothic church in Rome, and that a modern one, argues nothing against the Gothic style of architecture; nor, consequently, does the Roman preference for plain chant in the ordinary services of the Church prove aught against figured music, properly adapted to the divine service, and properly sung at it. The general custom of having musical vespers in the city of Rome at the great feasts, the Palestrina music of the Papal choir, and the beautiful *Misereres* sung in the Sistine Chapel during Holy Week, sufficiently prove the truth of this statement. When making a charge of this kind, it is always beneficial to recollect what Horace says: "In vitium ducit culpæ fuga." (*Ars Poetica*, v. 31.)

Even the modern drama owes its origin to the Church. Who does not know that during the Middle Ages, when Papal influence was supreme, the "Mystery" plays were often performed in the church or the churchyard, the clergy taking the principal parts. The "*Moralities*," as another species of mediæval dramatic composition was called, were also of religious origin. It was only when these plays degenerated and became blasphemous that the Church authorities condemned them. The oft-recurring drama performed under Church sanction at Oberammergau, is a reminder of the Church plays of the past, and the fact that even the ecclesiastical colleges in Rome allow their students, during Carnival time, to take part in dramatic performances, proves that the Church sanctions the drama, when it does not degrade itself by immorality or infidelity. The Church prohibitions of theatres, and condemnation of actors and actresses, at certain times, were not universal, but either local or in consequence of abuses which had crept into and defiled the temples of the Muses. The Pontificate never put its ban upon the Muses, unless they laid aside the robes of decency. St. John's Gospel is a beautiful drama, full of dialogue and sparkling with wit. St. Peter's Epistles show



that the first Pontifical Fisherman had a poetic soul, and poetic tastes which have been imitated by many of his successors, down to the present poet-pontiff, Leo XIII.

It would be hard to find, even without their divine inspiration, two more eloquent discourses than St. Peter's two Epistles. They are more earnest than Cicero's attacks on Catiline, or Demosthenes' invectives against Philip; and superior to the best productions of these great pleaders in force of argument and clearness of statement. After reading them, it would be difficult not to obey the holy Fisherman, when, in language prompted by what he had often seen when he watched by the sea of Galilee to draw his nets at break of day, he says: "*Attend as to a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise in your hearts.*" (II. Ep., chap. i. v. 19.)

At the very threshold of our investigation into the literary taste of the Papacy, we are met with an objection taken from a text in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter xix. v. 16, in which we read that the Christian converts "brought together *their books* and burnt them before all: and counting the price of them, they found the money to be fifty thousand pieces of silver." From this passage it is argued that the early Christians, and consequently the Popes, were hostile to literature, and that they burned all the books which were not of service to religion. But the context proves that this inference is illogical; for there is question only of books of astrology or magic: "*Ιχάνοι δὲ τῶν τα περίεργα πραξάντων*;" besides, allusion is made to some of the Ephesians alone, and not to the conduct of all the Christians. We have a manifest proof that whatever the Ephesians may have done, they had not the sanction of St. Paul, who, speaking to the Athenians, quotes frequently from the Greek poets, as St. Jerome demonstrates in his seventieth epistle. Moreover, the Christian writers of the first ages show a full knowledge of the opinions and of the works of the pagan authors; and, in fact, we get full information regarding many points of ancient philosophy from the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and other Christians. This shows that there was no prohibition against reading or studying the pagan classics. It is true that we have a Canon of an early Council (iv. Council of Carthage, chapter xvi.), forbidding bishops to read the works of pagan authors; but this is a prohibition made for the bishops of those times only, whose principal care should be to attend to the wants of their flocks, which they had been neglecting. In this sense we are also to understand St. Jerome's complaint in his twenty-first epistle: "That there are some priests who, throwing aside the Gospels and the Prophets, read comedies, sing love songs, and contin-

ually peruse Virgil." But it is evident that he is only reprehending an abuse, for he himself, rigid though he was, names various profane authors whom he used to read. In his introduction to the Prophet Daniel, he tells us by way of apology, that if he occasionally alludes to the classical authors, it is for the purpose of showing that the things predicted by the Prophets "may be found in the works of the Greeks and the Latins, and in the writings of other peoples."

Of course the severity of the persecutions would naturally prevent the early Christians from being learned, since education, to be complete, needs leisure, wealth and encouragement. In spite, however, of numerous difficulties, many of the Roman Christians especially were proficient in literature. For instance, the Martyr St. Cassian, of Imola, in Italy, kept a public school. Prudentius, in his ninth hymn, "*Peti Stephanon*," tells us that while Cassian was teaching, a persecution arose, during which he was accused of being a Christian :

*"Præfuerat studiis puerilibus et grege multo  
Septus magister litterarum sederat.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Ecce Fidem quatiens tempestas sæva premebat  
Plebem dictatam Christianæ gloriæ."*

The poet then describes how the teacher was killed by his idolatrous pupils, who stabbed him with their *styli*, used for writing. The best authorities, among others the Bollandists, inform us that this took place, at the latest, during the reign of Diocletian. Prudentius, who was born A.D. 348, speaks of the fact as of an ancient occurrence. It proves, therefore, that the laws of the Roman Church were not adverse to the cultivation of letters in the first centuries. The reader will recollect that we are writing only of what occurred in the neighborhood of the Roman Pontiffs, and need not extend our investigations to the schools of Greece or of Africa, in which Christian philosophers flourished before Justin, and Catholic rhetoricians taught before Augustine. There were Christian public schools of philosophy in Alexandria, as every one knows, before the conversion of Constantine, and Pantæus, Ammonius, Clement, and Origen rendered them famous. Nor is it true that those who had taught eloquence or poetry while pagans, were obliged to give up their profession on becoming Christians. Lactantius, after his conversion, taught rhetoric in Nicomedia; and Minutius Felix, although a Christian, pleaded cases in the Roman Forum. He could not have done this without Papal sanction. These writers are of the third century. Minutius, in his dialogue called "*Octavius*," beautifully and learnedly defends Christianity, and ridicules the superstitions of Paganism. Yet, in the exordium



of that work he clearly states that he went out of Rome to take a vacation from his forensic labors; thus showing that even under Paganism, a man might be a learned lawyer and practice his profession, while he remained a good Christian. The persecution, it should be understood, did not strike all the prominent Christians, nor did it destroy all the Christian churches.

It is probable that many of the learned in Rome and elsewhere followed the example of Minutius in the West, and continued the practice of their profession, as many in the East followed the example of St. Justin the Martyr, who wore his philosopher's cloak, and taught philosophy, even after his conversion. Thus, in the reign of Commodus, there was a Christian Senator named Apollonius, who was permitted to write a defence of his faith, and read it publicly in the Senate.<sup>1</sup> He was, nevertheless, beheaded. The historian Eusebius narrates the same fact; and further adds that he was learned in letters and in philosophy.<sup>2</sup> Such a prominent man must have been intimate with the reigning Popes, and must have had their blessing in his labors. Nor was the learned profession or medicine wanting in its Christian converts, who imitated the physician, St. Luke, the Evangelist. The learned Dominican Mamachi, in his great work on Christian Antiquities, gives us the names of several Christian physicians recorded on ancient tablets pertaining to the first two centuries of our era. These facts suffice to show that Papal influence was not adverse to the cultivation of letters in the first ages.

The truth is that the Popes encouraged learning then as now. The names and numbers of those Latins who, although Christians, were renowned not only for their sacred, but for their profane knowledge also, in the first centuries, show this plainly.

Cave, a learned Protestant writer, and Ceillier, a distinguished historian, give abundance of instances of ecclesiastical writers of prominence in the early ages; but our limits prevent us from doing more than referring the reader to them. Now, it is legitimate to infer that men who manifested excellence of style in dealing with sacred subjects, must have occasionally shown a similar excellence in dealing with other topics when occasion required them to be treated. The pen that could write a beautiful homily did not forget its cunning when it wrote on music or some other fine art. Among the first Popes St. Clement is remarkable for a letter to the Corinthians; and a second letter to them, as well as the "Apostolical Constitutions," is attributed to him. Common fame evidently considered him a writer of no ordinary ability. We have

<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome de Viris Illustribus, c. xlii.

<sup>2</sup> Hist. Eccl. l. vxxxi.

a letter attributed to Pope St. Cornelius, and fragments attributed to St. Stephen.

I. St. Soter, made Pope A.D. 168, wrote a work against the Montanists. Sigebert, an author of the twelfth century, tells us that St. Linus, the immediate successor of St. Peter, wrote a book on the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul. But the assertion of Sigebert lacks proof.

Caius, a Roman priest, afterwards bishop, in the third century, wrote a work against the Montanists, some fragments of which have been preserved by Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> Hermes, a brother of Pope Pius I., wrote a book on the celebration of Easter, according to the statement of trustworthy antiquarians like Liruti and Fontanini. Novatian, before he became a schismatic, wrote a work on the food of the Hebrews, and another on the Trinity, which won for him Papal approval. The greatest, however, of all the Roman writers, who were Christian, during the three first centuries, was Lactantius, who, although he was most probably not a native of the city of Rome, yet was of a Roman family, as he himself tells us. Besides his own statement, his name Lactantius Cœlius or Cecilius, Firmianus, proves his Roman origin; and his style, which is far superior in elegance and purity to that of the Africans Tertullian and St. Cyprian, confirms the probability. His book on the *Death of the Persecutors*, which cannot strictly be called an ecclesiastical work, takes rank among the best histories. His "Divine Institutions," which is a refutation of Gentile superstitions, is, however, purely religious in character.

It should, however, be observed in justice to the Popes who lived during the period antecedent to Constantine, that the turbulence of Rome and of Italy, which destroyed the opportunities for literary pursuits, and the persecutions to which the Church was subjected, prevented them from giving to literature all that time and patronage which under other circumstances they might have given. How could Christians study with persecution, like the sword of Damocles, hanging over their heads? How could Pontiffs find time to encourage letters, when they and their flocks lived in continual peril of their lives? The dead martyrs had to be buried, and the living confessors consoled; the churches had to be built and regulated, and discipline established. In order that literature should flourish there must be peace and prosperity. Owing to the condition of the early Roman Christians, we should not be surprised to find their Greek and African brethren excel them; for in many cases there was less disorder and persecution in places remote from the capital than in it. Speaking, therefore, from a Roman standpoint,

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Eccl., l. ii. cxxv. l. iii. cap. xxvii.

it is not astonishing that in the early ages the foreigners who distinguished themselves among the Christians by their writings, should surpass the natives of Rome. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenæus, Justin, Denis of Alexandria, and others were all Greeks. The Papacy had to travel through the dark days of pagan persecution and immorality, and the invasions of barbarian ignorance before it reached the acme of its literary greatness in the age of Leo X. No matter what might be the natural tastes of the Pontiffs for letters in those early ages, they knew that their first duty was the salvation of souls. They could not cultivate the muses, while they saw around them a sea of infamy and corruption unparalleled in the history of the human race. It was more important in those days to teach the degraded people the principles of the Catechism, to write an epitome of the Bible, than to deal in epic verse or rhetorical eloquence. Who that has read the pages of Tacitus's history, or the satires of Juvenal, both authors of the post-Augustan age, the one a contemporary of the Popes Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clement I., Evaristus, Alexander I., and Sixtus I. (from A.D. 55 to A.D. 117), the other a contemporary of the same Popes except Peter, can fail to realize that the horrible condition of public morals in the Roman capital must have concentrated all the zeal of the Pontiffs in opposition to it? No matter what their tastes or love for literature might have been, they must have felt that the imperial court should be purified first; that the immoral influences of Crispinus, Proculus, Matho, Thymeles, Laronia,<sup>1</sup> and the other educated men and women (*Socratici* as they were called),<sup>2</sup> whose unnatural vices disgraced humanity and Rome, should be first counteracted, and that the rising Church should be guarded from the universal decay that on all sides surrounded her in the decrepit Empire. Considering these circumstances and the fact that the time of the Popes was mostly taken up in the care of the proper administration of the Church, we should not be astonished to find so few of them given to literary pursuits, but rather surprised to find so many Christians cultivating letters in those centuries of persecution. But no sooner was peace given to the Church than the Christians made great progress in literary studies, even so early as the reign of Constantine; a fact which is well proven by the conduct of Julian, the apostate, towards their schools and professors. Having observed that force had not succeeded in destroying Christianity, he determined to degrade it by condemning the Christians to ignorance. Accordingly he made a law prohibiting the Christian rhetoricians and grammarians of the Empire from teaching unless they became pagans. Even Ammianus Marcellinus, although an idolater, calls

<sup>1</sup> Names found in Juvenal's satires *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Sat. II. v. 10.



this law cruel: "*Illud inclemens quod docere vetuit magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos Christianos, nisi transissent ad minimum cultum.*"<sup>1</sup> Julian himself, in one of his letters, mentions this edict.<sup>2</sup> The consequence of it was, that Christian literature was retarded. Some of the ablest Christian professors resigned their chairs, notably Præresius, a celebrated sophist of Athens, and Marius Victorinus Africanus, a Roman rhetorician. The latter is praised for his sacrifice by St. Augustine.<sup>3</sup> The Christians were prevented not only from teaching school, but even from studying poetry, eloquence, or philosophy, that they might become despicable by their ignorance. The Protestant authors of the old Irish penal laws must have had this edict of Julian in their minds when they set a price on the head of the Irish Catholic schoolmaster. Fortunately for the Christians Julian reigned but a few years. Yet literature of all kinds languished at this time in Rome. The era of decadence had set in. The barbarians were crossing the frontier. Strangers crowded into Rome; and although some brought learning, most of them brought ignorance. The Popes and the Church now became the creators of a new literature as well as of a new civilization; and few have sufficiently appreciated the difficulty of their labor, or the debt of gratitude which is due to them for it. The peace of Constantine, marred for a time by Julian, brought forth abundant fruits in the Church of the fourth and of the beginning of the fifth century. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, in the East, and Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, in the West, supplied the places left vacant by the great pagan writers. The impartial reader must admit that these Christian writers surpass in beauty of sentiment and power of thought all the ancient classical authors. In style only are they perhaps deficient; but this was a natural consequence of the decay of the languages which they spoke owing to the influence of the aggressive and restless barbarians.

It was but natural that in this early golden age of Christian literature the Popes and their immediate dependents should be found conspicuous; and in fact we find at this time the first establishment of parochial schools, sometimes held in the very residence of the bishop. A canon of the Second Council of Vaison, celebrated in the year of our Lord 529, is given by the learned Father Thomasin:<sup>4</sup> "All parish priests, according to the beneficial custom which we know has prevailed throughout the whole of Italy, should keep in their houses young students; and as good fathers, provide for them

<sup>1</sup> Hist., lib. xxii. ch. x. et lib. xxv. ch. iv.    <sup>2</sup> Epist. xlii.    <sup>3</sup> Confess., l. viii. c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Disciplin. de Benef., par ii. lib. i. chap. lxxxviii. No. 10, quoted by Tiraboschi, Lit. It., Tom. II. lib. iv. capo ii. Tiraboschi., Modena edition of 1787, says this council was held in A.D. 526, but this is evidently a printer's mistake.

spiritually by teaching them the psalms and the sacred lessons, and by instructing them in the law of God, so that these students may be worthy to succeed them in the ministry." Thus we perceive that Papal influence, before the sixth century, created the much-esteemed system of parish schools that once flourished over the greater portion of continental Europe.

We find in the fourth century the celebrated Pope Damasus, the patron and prompter of St. Jerome in his learned works on the Holy Scripture. St. Damasus, who governed the Church from A.D. 366 to A.D. 384, was not only remarkable for his prose writings, but for his poetry also. Some of his letters still existing and a number of his sacred epigrams bear witness to the fact. St. Leo the Great, who was Pope from the year 440 to 461, is another of the literary Popes. His letters prove him to have been a man of erudition in profane as well as in sacred questions. He gathered around him all the most learned men of his age; and by their lustre made his court the prototype of that of Leo X. in the sixteenth century. The names of Zeno, bishop of Verona, Philastrius, and Gaudentius of Brescia, Paulinus of Nola, Peter Chrysologus, Ambrose, and Rufinus of Aquileia, and others who flourished about this time, show the Roman sky as usual studded with a galaxy of brilliant stars.

It must, however, be admitted that the style of these writers shows a corrupt taste, and that the influence of the barbarian languages gradually destroyed the purity of the tongue of Cicero and Horace. St. Augustine, in the eighth book of his *Confessions*, extols the Christian rhetorician, Marius Victorinus Africanus, who taught eloquence in Rome; calls him a learned old man, versed in all the liberal arts, who had read, examined, and explained many of the works of the philosophers, and had translated some of the writings of Plato into Latin; tells us that he was the teacher of many noble senators, and had deserved and obtained by the fame of his professorship a statue in the forum of Trajan. The Saint further tells us how Victorinus was converted into the Christian faith, and made public profession of it in the Church, after following it secretly for awhile. Yet the works attributed to him that remain show him to be inferior to his reputation. Some of them are on rhetoric and grammar, while others are purely of a religious character. This distinguished rhetorician, the master of St. Jerome, was the friend of the Roman Pontiff and scholar, Damasus.

If our purpose in this article were to give an account of the condition of education in the Catholic Church, at different periods of the Pontificate, and by showing that in every age Churchmen strove to advance the cause of learning and science, and then, by inference, to give the credit of each Churchman's efforts, no matter

from what place he might come, to the Papacy as having inspired him, we should have to speak of the Athenian sophists who flourished after the Christian era, as well as of those who were renowned in the West, not only in Rome but in the provinces. A modern author gives an interesting account of the Christian rhetoricians who taught in Athens.<sup>1</sup> When Julian, the apostate, forbade the Christians to teach in the public schools, he made an exception in favor of the celebrated Præresius, but he (Præresius) was too generous to stand alone, and though he probably had little in him of the martyr's stuff, he forbore to lecture when his friends were silenced.<sup>2</sup> We should have to speak of the many Christian professors who taught in Milan and Berytus as well as in Rome and Athens; of Symmachus, Donatus, Prudentius, Porphyrius, Proba, and the other Christian poets, *rhetoires* and sophists, of the Lower Empire, who kept alive the traditions of the past, and the light of education among the ever-increasing darkness and decadence of the centuries immediately preceding the Middle Ages. But we wish to confine ourselves to the personality of the Popes as much as possible, and show by historical facts what they personally did for the advancement of literature before the eleventh century.

We pass rapidly over the names of Cassiodorus, and the monks who under Papal supervision during the sixth and seventh centuries copied and preserved the classic masterpieces, within the sanctuary of their monasteries, from destruction by the hordes of ignorant barbarians, who overwhelmed the Roman empire, and endeavored to destroy even the vestiges of its civilization. The Papacy during this period of gloom was the pillar of fire which gave light to the struggling nations.

Cassiodorus singles out one name, that of a Roman priest, Dionysius, called the "*Little*," on account of the smallness of his stature, as a proof of the literary culture of the Romans of his time. He calls him "a man versed in Greek and Latin literature; in whom great simplicity is united to great eloquence and learning; a perfect Catholic, and a faithful follower of the traditions of the fathers."<sup>3</sup> This writer was but one of many who still flourished under the fostering care of the Papacy. The line of literary Popes was never broken for any length of time. Yet there is a charge to be answered at this very place against one of the most learned of the early Popes, no less a personage than Gregory the Great. He has been called the Attila of literature in the sixth century by such writers as Brucker.<sup>4</sup> Three charges are made against this great

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Capes, A. M., "University Life in Ancient Athens."

<sup>2</sup> University Life, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup> Cassiodorus de Inst. Div. Liter. c. xxiii.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. Crit. Philos. i, iii, p. 560.



Pontiff, that he drove the mathematicians out of his court; that he burned the Palatine library; and that he discouraged and forbade the study of Belles-lettres. Let us answer them briefly. Who is said to make the accusation that Gregory exiled the mathematicians? John, of Salisbury, who lived six centuries after the Pope. Gregory died A.D. 604; John, A.D. 1180. But what does the monk say? Merely this: "*Doctor Sanctissimus ille Gregorius . . . mathesim jussit ab aula recedere.*" He is the only ancient writer who makes this statement.<sup>1</sup> He does not say that the Christians were forbidden to study mathematics, or that the mathematicians were severely punished, but only sent away from the court. But what were these mathematicians, and what was the nature of the science which they cultivated? John of Salisbury plainly leads us to the inference that they were astrologers, not true mathematicians, and that their so-called science was astrology. Moreover, only that portion of the Palatine library was destroyed which contained books of fortune-tellers, oracles, and false predictions. This also is evident from the words of John of Salisbury: "*Sed ut traditur a majoribus, incendio dedit probatæ lectionis, . . . 'Scripta Palatinus quæcumque tenebat Apollo,' in quibus erant præcipua, quæ cælestium mentem, et superiorum oracula videbantur hominibus revelare.*"<sup>2</sup> From this passage of the writer it is clear that Gregory condemned only false science and superstition, which were then making inroads on the faith, and condemned to the flames only the worthless oracles of paganism. Brucker knew that in ancient times mathematician and astrologer were frequently synonymous terms; and, in fact, he makes this statement in his work.<sup>3</sup>

The Palatine library had been founded for the public use on the top of the Palatine Hill, by the Emperor Augustus. That Gregory burned this library is given as a piece of traditional gossip by the garrulous and not very reliable old monk of the 12th century, John of Salisbury: "*Fertur*"—"it is said"—he writes "that Gregory burned the library." If Gregory did burn it, it was because the books in it were bad. But it is not probable that John of Salisbury writes the truth. We have a life of Gregory written by John the Deacon, a much earlier authority than the English monk, but not a word

<sup>1</sup> Polycrat. l. ii, cxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Idem.

<sup>3</sup> So learned a man as Brucker ought to have known that so early as the time of Tacitus, the mathematicians were put under the ban of even the Pagan law. It is quite evident, from the following passage, that those gentlemen did not confine themselves in those ages merely to the study of figures. "*Urgentibus etiam mathematicis, dum 'novos motus, et clarum Othoni annum, observatione siderum' affirmant: genus hominum potentibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostra et stabitur semper et retinebitur.*" The laconic historian gives them a very bad reputation; perhaps they were no better in Gregory the Great's time. Tacitus, Hist., lib. i. chap. xxii.

does it contain regarding what must have been a very important fact. We may, therefore, class it with other statements made by the same writer, as for instance, that Gregory prayed daily for the Emperor Trajan, and never stopped crying and praying for him until he had obtained the release of the Emperor's soul from the flames of hell!

Nor are we to believe the charge made against Gregory on the authority of writers of the fifteenth century, during the reign of Louis XI., King of France, that Gregory condemned the study of Cicero's and Livy's works. No historian worthy of the name will take the authority of a writer of the fifteenth, for the truth of a fact said to have occurred in the seventh century. Why should Gregory condemn innocent Cicero and Livy to the flames, while he overlooked Ovid, Juvenal, and Horace, who are impure and dangerous to youth, unless read with discretion?

There is a letter of Gregory to St. Leander, prefixed to his commentary on Job, in which he writes of the style and method of the Pagan classics: "*Unde et ipsam artem loquendi quam magisteria disciplinæ exterioris insinuant, servare despexi. Nam sicut hujus quoque epistolæ tenor enuntiat non metacissimi collisionem effugio non barbarismi confusionem devito: situs, motusque præpositionum casusque servare condemno; quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba cælestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.*" But what does this prove but that the great Pontiff was unwilling to sacrifice force and truth to style? That he did not believe that the use of the arts of the rhetorician should be the chief aim of a writer, or that sense should be sacrificed to sound, or to rounded phrases? It is as if a professor of homiletics were to tell his students: "Gentlemen, a simple statement of the truth is better than all the grammatical punctilio of Lindley Murray, or the rhetorical graces of Blair." And in fact, Gregory's writings prove that he was not indifferent to the graces of style. They are remarkable for beauty as well as for force; full of eloquence and even poetry. St. Gregory's modesty alone could make him call himself a barbarous or rough writer. Of him and his court his trustworthy biographer, John the Deacon, writes:<sup>1</sup> "*Videbantur passim cum eruditissimis clericis adhærere pontifici, religiosissimi monachi. . . . Tunc rerum sapientia Romæ sibi templum visibititer quodammodo fabricarat et septemplex artibus veluti columnis nobilissimorum totidem lapidum Apostolicæ sedis atrium fulciebat. Nullus Pontifici famulantium a minimo usque ad maximum barbarum quodlibet in sermone vel habitu præscferebat, sed togata Quiritum more, sua trabeata Latinitas suum Latium in ipso Latiali palatio singulariter*

<sup>1</sup> Vit. St. Gregory, l. ii. cxii.

*obtinebat. Refloruerant ibi diversarum artium studia.*" Thus do we find the court of the Pontiff filled with refined and cultivated men of letters. John the Deacon lived only two centuries after Gregory, and must, therefore, be considered the better authority in matters concerning the Pope and his age.

Among those learned men of Gregory's court, we should name Claudius, a monk of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome; another was St. Paterius, both authors of note. Pope Leo II., who ascended the Papal throne A.D. 682, was, according to Anastasius the librarian, "a most eloquent man, learned in Greek and Latin, an experienced musician, and a great reader."<sup>1</sup> Gregory II., who died A.D. 731, and Gregory III., who died A.D. 741, were also remarkable for their literary knowledge. Popes Zachary, A.D. 752, Stephen III., also men of letters, finish the history of the eighth century. That Rome still preserved the hegemony of letters is well proved by a fact recorded in the life of Charlemagne. In the year of our Lord 787 he went to Rome and brought back a corps of professors of grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, music, etc., to instruct his people and teach in the schools which he was establishing.<sup>2</sup> The inspiration which the Great Emperor had received at the capital of Christendom soon manifested itself. *Bonum est diffusivum sui.* Schools multiplied. Every parish priest in the empire was obliged to keep school, and teach the children of his parish, "*sans autre rémunération que les dons volontaires des parents.*"<sup>3</sup> In view of well-authenticated facts such as these, how can the assailants of the papacy conscientiously charge the Popes with endeavoring to keep the people ignorant?

The Liber Pontificalis, attributed to Anastasius, the Roman librarian, himself a light of the age, gives us an account of the Popes of the ninth century, and represents them as men worthy to rank on the score of education with the most illustrious successors of St. Peter. Adrian I., Eugenius II., and Gregory IV., were all men of letters. Eugenius II. held a Council at Rome, A.D. 826, in which a decree was promulgated for the establishment of public schools. Leo IV., Nicholas I. and Stephen V., elected Pope A.D. 855, not only were learned themselves, but had courts remarkable for their literary character.

But in the tenth century there was a partial eclipse of science in Rome. The ninth century had died in a blaze of glory, with the arts and sciences flourishing all over Italy. The twilight still lingered around the Imperial City for the first half of the tenth century; nor did the darkness ever become general. It is true that we have

<sup>1</sup> Scrip. Rev. Ital., vol. iii. p. i.

<sup>2</sup> Vie de Charlemagne, by August Vetault, page 396.

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem.



a statement made in the Council of Rheims, A. D. 992, that few in Rome knew at that time the elements of literature. But this assertion was gratuitous, and prompted by one of those local jealousies for which the political divisions and quarrels of the time are an explanation. "*Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*," says Juvenal, and how, therefore, are we to believe that all the learning of the ninth century perished at once and left no progeny. Tiraboschi, a most excellent authority upon this subject, tells us<sup>1</sup> that Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, speaking of Rome at this time, says "that in Rome the sciences still flourished better than elsewhere." The few unfortunate Popes who at that period cast a shadow over the Chair of Peter by their personal delinquencies, did not destroy the light which has always shone around the Capital of Christendom. Otto, Bishop of Vercelli, as well as Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, kept up the reputation of the Church for science and learning. Ratherius died A.D. 974. The study even of Greek literature was not neglected by the Popes, in the very darkest of the so-called dark ages. In the year 816, Pope Stephen IV. founded the monastery of St. Praxedes, and placed in it a congregation of Greek monks, who used their own rite in the celebration of the divine mysteries; and Leo IV. about the same time introduced Greek monks and professors into the monastery of Sts. Stephen and Cassian.<sup>2</sup> Anastasius, the librarian of whom we have already spoken, was an excellent Greek scholar.<sup>3</sup>

Luitprand, a deacon of the Cathedral of Pavia, afterwards Chancellor of King Berenger II., then a courtier in the palace of the German emperor, Otho I., and finally made by him Bishop of Cremona, a bitter partisan of the German faction, has maligned the Popes of the tenth century, and painted it and them in blacker colors than they really deserve. It is true that the Church was then like an athlete, fatigued by many struggles and many triumphs; it is true that each wave of barbarian invasion, as it broke over Christian Italy, filled its plains with ruin and covered civilization with the lava of ignorance; it is true that the Irish missionaries who evangelized Europe in the sixth century had not completely succeeded in converting the savage hordes of feudal freebooters and brutal peasants of Southern Europe; it is true that Rome and Italy were filled in the 10th century with lords, barons, marquises, counts and princes, each the leader of a faction, struggling for power; armed bandits, like the Norman nobles of the twelfth century, recognizing

<sup>1</sup> Storia della Letteratura Italiana. Tom. III. p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> The best authority on this subject is Ozanam's admirable work on "Civilization Among the Franks."

<sup>3</sup> Muratori, Script. Rer. Ital., Vol. III. P. I. p. 215.

no law but violence, and striving to get control of the Papacy as the recognized central source of power, by which they could have the prestige of law in their favor, although they despised it themselves, and thus intimidate their enemies. Rome, it is true, was rent by these feudal faction fights. A few Popes were intruded by force into the See of Peter. Yet, although these causes delayed the progress of letters, they did not completely extinguish their shining. The monasteries, like busy hives, were silently working, preparing to display all their fruits when the period of confusion should have passed away, when peace should be restored, faction and turbulence be quelled, law resume its sway, and the chair of St. Peter its glory, as it did under the immortal Hildebrand. To the calumnies of Luitprand, the enemy of the Popes, we may oppose the truthful statements of Flodoard, a contemporary writer. He shows that in spite of the dangers to which the papacy was subjected by the struggles of the Italian and German parties to control it for political purposes, it seldom was tarnished by dishonor or ignorance, and that most of the charges made by the Germanizing Luitprand are false. Flodoard's authority is sustained by that of John the Deacon, who was his contemporary, and by Leo Marsicanus, who flourished in the following century. Flodoard lived and wrote in the early part of the tenth century, and was learned and unpartisan. His authority is, therefore, of greater weight than that of Luitprand, who was biassed and wrote at a later date.<sup>1</sup>

The clouds of the tenth century soon disappeared, when Pope Sylvester II. ascended the Papal throne. This Pope, at one time abbot of the monastery founded at Bobbio by the Irish monks who had evangelized Gaul in the sixth century, was renowned as a mathematician and musician long before he became Pope. The name of Gerbert, afterwards Sylvester II., will always be an answer to those who accuse the Popes of having been hostile to the cultivation of the natural sciences. There is no longer a doubt about the further development of literary studies. Gregory VII., A.D. 1078, holds a Council at Rome in which all bishops are commanded to open schools, which should be attached to their churches; and the Third General Council of Lateran, held by Alexander III., A.D. 1179, caps the climax of Papal zeal in the cause of education, by ordering that bishops and priests should not only know the sciences becoming to their state, but expressly commands that, in order that the poor shall not remain deprived of the opportunities of learning, in every cathedral church there shall be a master to teach school *gratuitously to all poor scholars*; and that no one should exact a license fee from any such school-teacher. This regulation was after-

---

<sup>1</sup> A noteworthy instance of Luitprand's mendacity is given in the case of Pope Sergius III. *Vide* Wouter's Hist. Eccl. p. 77, edition of Louvain, 1871.

wards incorporated as a portion of the canon law. When we consider that in those days bishops were more numerous than they are now, and that almost every small city had a cathedral church, we must admit that the people of the early portion of the eleventh century could not have been so badly off for the means of education.

We have seen by the words of the Council of Vaison, already quoted (A.D. 529), that parish schools had been established all over Italy, as early as the fifth century, and this decree of Pope Alexander III. continues the noble tradition of the Papacy in favor of the system. The eleventh century begins the history of the great universities of Europe.<sup>1</sup>

There were eight General Councils, and a countless number of particular ones held before the eleventh century. The General Councils were filled with Roman scholars, and presided over by Roman legates. Is there one of them whose decrees do not indicate the work of learned men, and of men remarkable even for the graces of style and diction? The particular Councils were inspired from the same source, and had their value only inasmuch as they were sanctioned by the Popes. Hardly one of these Councils but is occupied with questions regarding education and the means to be taken for its advancement. In what, then, were the Popes opposed to literature? How can rulers who make laws for centuries commanding their subjects to found schools and educate the people gratuitously, be considered foes of science?

The Roman *Bullarium* is an immense work. Volumes are filled with the bulls and briefs and letters of the Roman Pontiffs. Let them be examined, and although we admit that the critic may find in them some evidence of a corrupt taste, owing to the exigencies of the subject and the formulas of the *Curia*, we are certain that his impartiality will admit them to be masterpieces of learning, of logic, theology, philosophy and style. We do not ask him to read the eloquent Bull of Pius IX. defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; or the last elegantly written encyclical of Leo XIII.; or to peruse the briefs of the classic Leo X.; but we send him back to the days of Leo I., Gregory I., Agapitus, Gelasius, Damasus, Sylvester II., and Gregory VII., for passages of Ciceronian purity and Demosthenic energy.

Even Hallam, who is, in my opinion, a very bigoted author, is obliged to render justice to the fostering care of the Papacy for

---

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of the universities which began their career in the eleventh century, Hallam says: "From this time the Golden Age of Universities commenced; and it is hard to say whether they were favored most by their sovereigns, or by the See of Rome."—Middle Ages, p. 524.



letters : "A continual intercourse was kept up between Rome and the several nations of Europe ; her laws were received by the bishops, her legates presided in Councils ; so that a common language was as necessary in the Church as it is at present in the diplomatic relations of kingdoms."<sup>1</sup> He gives this and the existence of monasteries as the chief means of preserving the ancient classics from destruction during the early portion of the Middle Ages. The facts which we have given corroborate his opinion. The Popes did indeed preserve literature, and promote and protect its growth and progress. The bright light of Christian literature, from the year 118 to 160,<sup>2</sup> when the Christian apologists first made the faith respectable in the eyes of Pagans, by a style and genius equal to their own, grew into the force and splendor of the age of Augustine and Ambrose ; and continued to illuminate the world with undiminished power even to the tenth century. Although then partially eclipsed by the surrounding ignorance of quarrelling barbarians, its rays broke through the clouds. It burst out into greater glory in the eleventh century under the reign of the mathematician and Pontiff, Sylvester II., and has continued unclouded from that day to this, through a line of saints and scholars, statesmen, theologians and poets, founders of schools and universities, through Gregory VII., Alexander III., Honorius III., Boniface VIII., Nicholas V., and Sixtus V., from Leo X., the Mæcenas of the sixteenth century, down to the present philosopher and poet, Leo XIII., whose intellectual brows are graced by the tiara, and whose pen is educating the world.

In modern times England had her golden age of literature under Elizabeth ; France followed with the age of Louis XIV. ; but before them all, and leading the way to all, was the golden age of Papal literature under Leo X. His age was the morning star, the first in the intellectual firmament to tell of the coming apparitions.—"*No-vissimus exit.*"

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallam's Middle Ages, p. 462.

<sup>2</sup> Aubé, Histoire des Persecutions de l'Eglise, t. ii.

## THE RAPID INCREASE OF THE DANGEROUS CLASSES IN THE UNITED STATES.

*The Dangerous Classes of New York City.* By C. L. Brace, New York, 1872.

EVERY sincere lover of his country, who has given more than a passing attention to the moral condition of our people, must experience alarm at the general lowering of the moral tone of the whole community, the increase of vice, the decline of commercial honesty and integrity in men intrusted with legislative, judicial, executive, and financial positions.

Looking lower down in the social scale we find the old body of honest yeomen and solid artisans disappearing, and a vast army growing up of men, women, and children even, who constitute a perpetual menace to the wellbeing of society.

These dangerous classes, the cockle sowed while men slept, are growing with such rapidity as to threaten to suffocate the good grain.<sup>1</sup> Dangerous in all countries, these classes are doubly dangerous with us, inasmuch as the men who belong to them are endowed with the right to vote, and surpassing honest electors in numbers or activity, succeed, and will succeed, in placing in the highest offices men at heart as unprincipled and unscrupulous as themselves, though the vice is gilded with the dress, the manners, the religious tone, of even the healthier portion of our community.

Fifty years ago pauperism was almost unknown in America. The cases were isolated, comparatively few, and not apparently hereditary. Now in every State the poorhouses are crowded with inmates, the country swarms with vagrants and those who, disinclined to work, or failing to secure it, swell their numbers. From this school come by the thousand criminals of every kind, only the opportunity and the knowledge being necessary to transform the tramp into the thief, burglar, incendiary, ravisher, or murderer. Every city has its organized gangs, every member of which has committed a series of crimes, all known more or less to the police force, permitted to exist, to thrive, to influence elections, escape indictment,

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of persons who live in crime and make a vocation of some line of criminal life in the city of New York, and in several of the cities of this State, increases more rapidly than the population. "Now it is a fact that the numbers, the fearlessness and the defiant organization of criminals against property have been increasing these several years past in the city of New York." Thirty-second Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York, pp. 92-3. "The increase of crime is shown by the census of the penal institutions to be assuming very serious aspects." "A statistical summary of the returns from courts of record in the year 1877 shows the important fact that there has been an increase of the classes of crime against property accompanied with violence." Thirty-third Report, p. 6.

trial, conviction, punishment, and constantly to recruit from the idle vagrants.

Every few years public attention is called to some of these ulcers of society. There will be public agitation, meetings will be held, associations formed, and an attempt made to obtain our usual panacea for all evils—new legislation. We have “Societies for Improving the Condition of the Poor,” “Prison Aid Societies,” “Liquor Prohibition Movements,” “Seamen’s Aid Associations,” “Midnight Missions,” “Female Guardian Societies,” “Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” as more important, and “to Children,” as of less consequence.

We have at this time movements against Chinese heathenism and vice, against Mormonism, against the Oneida Community, against tenement houses.

In all cases we find the idea to be simply to effect moral reformation by natural means—means which have in all times and all countries proved inadequate. The strange crusade of women against intemperance is almost solitary in its recognition of man’s inability to redeem man, and his necessity of God’s grace to enable him to rise.

The project to “put God into the Constitution,” seems to have sprung from a glimmering of the real truth, that as a people we are living without God in the world; but the remedy is not to put the name of the Creator into the paper Constitution, but to imbue the whole social system with the supernatural, the idea of God, its need of Him, its accountability to Him, and a loving desire to fulfil His will.

The wisest of the ancients, in considering the condition of mankind under the rule of paganism, hopelessly confessed the utter inadequacy of all human means of raising it to a better degree. They saw that it was like a man trying to soar in the air by tugging at his own belt; unless a God came to lift man out of the mire and misery into which he was fallen he must perish.

Christianity did this. It took that very heathen world, the polished pagan of Rome and Greece, the barbarous pagan of Britain, Gaul, Germany, and Scandinavia, changed their moral nature, so to say, extirpated vices, elevated the whole tone of Europe, freed the woman and the bondman, established Christian marriage, checked the inordinate pursuit of wealth and pleasure, and by creating higher aspirations gave examples in every condition of life which proved that God gave his graces to those who sought to do His will, enabling human nature by their aid to do what unassisted it must ever fail to accomplish.

For some centuries men have been steadily endeavoring to shake off this idea of Christian influence. The self-sufficiency of man is



the main thought that imbues most modern ideas, and the daily practical refutation it encounters does not seem to weaken in the least the popular belief. The consequence is the gradual undoing of the work of Christianity and the relapse of the nations into the condition of the old heathen world, without even the distorted idea of divine dependence which pervaded it.

The Reformation was a revolt against the idea of the supernatural. All radicals, free-thinkers, infidels, point to it as the commencement of man's disenthralment. The Protestant denominations, as they took form and cohesion, had to retain at first much that their doctrines did not include, and much of doctrine and practice that was gradually cast aside by succeeding generations.

In our own country we all know how strong the religious element was in forming the various little communities out of which our Republic grew, and how completely it has ceased to be a potency in our present State and General Governments, except so far as it is kept alive for the purpose of annoying Catholics or proselytizing. But for the presence of Catholicity in the country there would not be a sign of Christianity left.

With this general religious decline in America, came the steadily increasing worship of worldly prosperity and success. This has become in the minds of the masses of our countrymen the great test of true religion. We could cite volume after volume, in which the thrift, prosperity and wealth of Protestant communities are adduced as proof that Protestantism is the true religion, while poverty stamps the Catholic communities as being far from Christ.

That the view is utterly untenable and absurd, if the life and conduct of our Lord is considered, seems to make no difference. Although He chose poverty in His birth, poverty in life, the poor as His Apostles and disciples, secured not even comfort, much less wealth, for the mother whom He loved with a love no human heart can fathom; although every discourse breathes detachment from earthly things, and warnings against the accumulation of wealth, we are called upon by men who profess to be guided by the Scripture alone, to make this very devotion to this world's goods the highest test of virtue. Benjamin Franklin was in his day the great propagator of these ideas, and they have permeated our whole national life.

The fruit has been as pernicious as the tree. As the religious idea implanted in the colonies declined this took its place. In New England, for instance, in the old time, each town was a little community, contented, self-supporting. Distinctions of wealth were little regarded; the articles of clothing and food, furniture, vehicles, implements, were manufactured on the spot; the son was

content to follow the business of his father; the daughter did not expect to rise higher socially than her mother.

Now, the rural population depends on the great cities. Nothing is woven or spun on the farm; no furniture or implements made in the village. All come from some large city. Even supplies of food raised in the same county must come from town. With none of the old avenues of employment open, with the yearning for wealth that is inculcated almost from the cradle, the sons of the farmer and the mechanic disdain to follow the avocations of their fathers. They aim at something higher. The daughters, in the same spirit, vie with the butterflies of fashion in the cities and shrink from marriage with one of their own position. Of course, with this result, the education of a family becomes a fearful burden compared with former days. Children are dreaded, not welcomed. With the religious sentiment weakened crime begins in the household to prevent large families, thus deadening still more the moral sense.

As the sons would no longer till the soil, ply the plane or the sledge, or the shuttle, or maintain the fisheries, for which New England has always had a kind of idolatry, foreigners have flocked in to do the work which young Americans would not do, and girls came from other lands to do the work which the American born will no longer touch. Where some had attempted to hold on to the old customs, they found it impossible to compete with the new-comers, trained to harder work, poorer fare, and more slender remuneration.

The young men, all more or less educated in the common schools, feel above trades. They crowd our cities, overstock the professions and the houses of commerce. With little moral strength they enter the race where scheming, craft, cunning, and sharp dealing take the lead. The failures are more numerous than the successes.

Where moderate success is the lot of the young man, his desire to appear well increases, and as competition lowers his income, temptation comes. Debts are dishonestly incurred, contracts made with no intention of fulfilment, peculation, defalcation, fraud, and forgery lure many on deeper and deeper, and until exposure comes suddenly in middle life or as age approaches; and they sink to the lowest depths of moral degradation, even if they escape the punishment.

The multiplication of machines, the erection of factories, has contributed to the same result, and has doubtless by numerous failures sunk immense amounts of capital. These factories, seeking to reduce cost to the lowest possible amount, pay wages that offer no adequate inducement to the young people of the country, and again emigration supplies the unskilled labor. Irish, Cana-

dians, and Germans run New England factories, and Portuguese conduct her fisheries.

Our new States, the rich mines developed in California and the Rocky Mountain ranges, draw off many of the native rural population, of the disappointed class, or of those who shrink from earnest, steady labor, but hope to succeed by hook or crook. Yet numbers remain, numbers of vicious and apathetic, sinking lower and lower, till they become criminals by inheritance, or criminals by habit, all the more dangerous as they retain national characteristics of aptness, readiness, and persistency.

Even in comparatively new States, like Indiana, we are startled to find hereditary crime entailed through several generations. One of the journals of the capital of that State, entering into horrifying details, resulting from a thorough study of several cases in that city, says: "These people can hardly be said to have the intellect of the human family, but are like four-footed animals, guided more by instinct than intelligence." "Everything has been done that can be done by various benevolent institutions and societies, in hope of bettering their condition, but to no avail; they are still with us, spreading disease, pauperism, and crime."<sup>1</sup>

Reports of prison associations contain a mass of evidence in regard to the growth and entailment of crime in degenerating and degraded families and communities in interior counties of New York and other States. Mountain districts exist where no word of religious instruction seems ever to penetrate, where families live in a state of crime that can find no parallel in the most savage nations.

Similar reports come from all sections of the country, admitting alike the fact of the existence of this class, their increase and the utter failure of mere human means of remedy.

In the South, in times of slavery, the failures in society created the class of poor whites, shrinking from work that was done by slaves, becoming more ignorant and more debased with each generation, ignorant of religion to an extent that would scarcely be credited. In more northern States a rural population almost as bad has grown up, with an almost utter ignorance of the natural and revealed truths, and with scarcely a single aid against temptation to vice.

The churches, catching the spirit of the time, become more costly and luxuriant; the clergy are more men of the world; the poorer classes find that they are out of place in the new fine structures, or that they are not well-dressed enough to attend. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Indianapolis Saturday Herald, March 1, 1879.



Protestant churches have thus gone on isolating themselves from the poorer classes, exercising less and less influence over them; while at the same time they fail to win the young men even of the more wealthy, in whom the want of moral training is too evidently seen.

The Methodists and Baptists arose about the time these various causes began to act upon the population of this country. Their field was mainly among the poorer classes, and they undoubtedly contributed to keep alive a feeling of religion where the less sympathetic systems had lost all power. But they too have yielded to the influence of the times; the plain, earnest preachers have given place to better educated and more polished men, who do not reach the hearts of the poorer classes; over whom they are gradually losing all influence. Their plain meeting-houses are replaced by costly structures, to maintain which requires the cultivation of wealthy members; men are drawn in to take an active part, not in view of their religious and moral character, but in view of what they may give.

All these causes have tended to increase rapidly the comparative numbers of poor Americans, and leave them morally and religiously as destitute as they are in a worldly sense. With the decay of family devotion and religious instruction in families, the breaking up of marital and family ties by divorce, and the permitted growth of licentiousness, as well as the utter absence of religious influence in the schools,<sup>1</sup> the generations trained in these latter years are almost without either ideas or principles; as the prevalence of juvenile crimes but too sadly attests.

Thus church and school alike fail to exercise any salutary influence over this class of poor, who with every incentive to vice held out to them have nothing to help them to resist temptation. The Protestant churches in fact repel them. In the more prosperous American churches, in the regions to which modern styles of dress and living have extended, there are now but few poor people, and these feel more and more each year that the church is no home for them. There is for them, usually, no fraternal association with their more fortunate neighbors in the church, no wholesome, natural, cordial relation between them as human beings or brethren.

---

<sup>1</sup> The truth is, that the multiplication of "educated criminals," so-called, shows the urgency of moral as well as mental training in our schools and colleges. Had "California Jack," who recently argued his own case so ably on appeal to the Supreme Court as to obtain a new trial, known as much about the Ten Commandments as he knows about the State statutes, he might not now be in prison on a charge of burglary. The trouble is, not that men are uneducated, but that the moral and religious sentiments are too much neglected in our modern educational system.

ren. And there is a very large class, who are not extremely poor, but who are obliged to dress plainly and to practice rigid economy in order to obtain the necessities of life.<sup>1</sup>

This is so true that the Protestant church member falling into poverty and want, feels that he has lost all claim to spiritual care. The poor constantly feel their spiritual want. A Jesuit priest temporarily giving aid in a crowded city parish, had a sick-call just as he was about to retire, after a day spent in laborious visitations of the sick and distressed. It was long past the hour fixed by the rules of the parish, and he was about to direct inquiry as to the urgency of the case, when the servant told him that the person at the door was a colored man. As he knew no colored Catholics in the parish his curiosity was excited and he went to the door, where he found a very intelligent colored man.

He said that there was a lady dying at his rooms, who wished to see a clergyman, and that he had called to see whether one of the priests would not come.

"Is she your wife or sister?"

"Oh, no, sir, she is a lady—she is a white lady."

"Are you Catholics?"

"No."

"Then why do you come here?"

"Well, sir, this lady has been sick a good while; when her husband was a rich merchant down town, I was porter in his store; but he failed and died. She was very poor, and her friends all left her. She tried to make a living by sewing, but got paralyzed, and when I found it all out, I took her home and have done all I could for her. She is very low now, and wants a clergyman. She said 'it would be of no use to send to the minister of the church she used to attend on Fifth Avenue, and she did not suppose any of the ministers she used to know would come to her, now that she was so poor.' 'Well,' said I, 'Catholic priests go anywhere, they do not care how poor a person is, or how poor the place is,' and as she said she would like me to try, I have come here."

The priest went, of course, and Father Soderini's account is given only to show the feeling of isolation in the hearts of a large class of Protestant poor.

This alienation from the churches of the poorer American, and to some extent of the class who are struggling rather than poor, has been highly injurious. "Many," says the writer we have already quoted, "who are thus separating themselves from the churches, are injured by the change. They enjoy greater freedom from restraint, and often sink to a life of less strenuous effort at self-direct-

---

<sup>1</sup> Atlantic Monthly, October, 1878.

tion. They do not feel bound to resist temptation or deny appetite its gratifications."

A curious proof of the alienation of the lower strata of society from the Protestant churches, was seen in the general censure of a Brooklyn clergyman, who personally investigated the criminal classes.

His object was, perhaps, merely to afford a new sensation, but the censure bestowed upon him, revealed the fact that his associates in the ministry generally prided themselves on knowing nothing, and resolved by determining to know nothing, of the great ulcer of vice which is striking at the very vitals of our American social system. That any clergyman should have attempted to see what sin was, seemed unpardonable. Strange moral physicians! How blind, indeed, must be their treatment!

The Catholic priest, the Sister of Charity or Mercy, goes to the bedside of the repenting sinner, no matter how poor, no matter how fallen. How their hearts shrink within them God alone knows, as passing amid incarnate vice they reach the sufferer, enveloped in an atmosphere of their own that seems to leave its fragrance behind, and often leads to conversions, amendment, a total change in hearts that seemed utterly depraved, as in the case of Francis of Hieronymo, where a shameless woman, who openly mocked at him and his preaching, fell at his feet a sincere penitent, on beholding her pet dove fly from her arms and nestle on the mission cross, with its head turned to the Saint, as if listening to the words she despised.

Thus the Protestant churches have lost or are rapidly losing all hold on the poor. Religion in practice and theory is fast dying out among them. Without religion to guide them by her light and strengthen them by her ordinances, crime must make vast inroads among them. And it has done so in spite of all the advantages which our government and our social system are supposed to afford.

Had the standard of morality in the more cultivated classes been maintained, there would be a potent force of good example influencing those less liberally endowed with means and education, but unfortunately this is not the case. The higher class is itself gradually falling, and falling rapidly, in a moral point.

"Multitudes of Protestants who are professedly religious are not honest nor trustworthy. They declare themselves fit for heaven, but they will not tell the truth nor deal fairly with their neighbors. The money of widows and orphans placed under their control, is not safer than in the hands of highwaymen." . . . "They are not usually scrupulously truthful or conscientious, and do not believe



it possible to maintain a very high standard of justice or honesty in business life."

While all these causes were exercising their deleterious influence on the lower strata of American society, the higher were becoming more and more godless.

A writer in a leading New England periodical, treating on the subject a few months since, says: "There are still, of course, many truly religious people in the churches, who sincerely believe the old doctrines embodied in all the creeds. But these are everywhere a small minority, and they are mournfully conscious that the old religious life and power have departed from the church. . . . These people, who thus represent the better element of a former state of things, are the real strength of the evangelical Protestant churches, so far as religion is concerned. . . . They live pure and good lives. They speak the truth, a rare virtue now, and they can be trusted with anybody's money. . . . But they are too few to regenerate the American churches, . . . and their number and strength diminish from year to year."

"The influence of the churches and of religion upon the morals and conduct of men has greatly declined, and is still declining. There is yet, as I have said, a large amount of moral force and healthful life in the churches. Religion is not extinct. But the really significant fact here is that it is constantly losing ground. The empire of religion over human conduct, its power as a conservative moral and social force, is so far lost, that some things which are indispensable to the existence of society can no longer be supplied from this source without a great increase of vitality in religion itself. The morality based upon the religion popularly professed has, to a fatal extent, broken down."<sup>1</sup>

Protestantism in reality never was able to live except by employing the power of the State to enforce its doctrines and discipline. When that power is taken away, it must decline; it has no doctrine which it can infallibly say men must believe, nor ordinances which it can say men must practice to be saved.

As it is left to each one to decide for himself, less and less is done, and the interest dies out. The earlier colleges in the country, like the early schools, were all deeply religious. The New England Primer contained many of the truths necessary for salvation, and they were impressed on the mind from the youngest class in school to the highest in college.

Now, religion is banished from the schools; the colleges of old date are rapidly throwing aside religious influence and becoming

---

<sup>1</sup> *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1878.

rationalistic; the new collegiate institutions established under the auspices of the State, and not of Protestant denominations, especially at the West, are absolutely unchristian in their tendency, and send out young men imbued with all the scientific objections to Christianity, without any definite ideas of what the fundamental truths of Christianity are.

Thus throughout our social system there is a sweeping away of the religious basis of life. The commandments of God are scarcely known, and do not come to the mind as something that must be obeyed.

There is no guarantee of moral conduct: men avoid vice from absence of temptation, not from any love of God and virtue or from desire for a higher and better life.

Prayer is becoming something unknown. Whether a person of some education or one of the poorer and more ignorant class sees death suddenly menace him, there seems to be an utter absence of all idea of the responsibility of man to his Creator.

The lingering idolatry of the Bible makes him call for some one to read a passage taken at random, as though it could act as a kind of charm; another is asked to pray, and searches his memory for some words of prayer learned in childhood. That the man himself should awaken sorrow in his heart for sin, love for that God who has so long spared him in his disobedience, and who still gives him time to repent and return, is rarely the case. In fact, the fundamental ideas of religion, of man's responsibility to God, of the enormity of sin and its punishment seem lost. And if they cannot be aroused in the face of death, they surely can exercise little moral influence in ordinary life.

Thus our whole social system tends to increase vice and crime. The more cultivated classes, trained more or less to rationalism or indifference, with a religion that has lost all power for good, are kept within bounds only by human considerations, and these are but frail barriers against vice. The poor, isolated more and more from religious influence, are fast losing all ideas of Christianity, and laying aside every vestige they have hitherto retained.

We cannot, therefore, wonder at the increase of dishonesty and profligacy in the higher classes, or the grosser vices of those beneath them.

Let us now consider the foreign element in this country, and its moral condition.

The first great emigration here was Irish and Catholic. It was in the main pure, virtuous, healthy in body and mind, industrious, anxious for work. Its faults arose from a convivial disposition, making it easily led to excess in drink, and then quarrelsome and noisy. That its good qualities far counterbalanced the bad, cannot be

disputed. Every sound principle of political economy dictated that the community into which the immigrants came should do all to increase every moral influence tending to control the evil and augment the good. Unfortunately, a mingled hatred and contempt for the Irish character had been fostered from early days in New England, and spread more or less through the country. One need but read the "Simple Cobbler of Agawam" to see how unchristian and almost diabolical feelings were nurtured in the hearts, not of ignorant New England colonists, but of the clergy who considered themselves the "salt of the earth." A writer who has inherited no little of this old feeling, although he cloaks it through policy, Brace, admits that "the Irish are at home one of the most law-abiding and virtuous of populations;" and he says truly: "There is no question that the breaking of the ties with one's country has a bad moral effect, especially on a laboring class. The emigrant is released from the social inspection and judgment to which he has been subjected at home, and the tie of Church and priesthood is weakened. If a Roman Catholic, he is often a worse Catholic, without being a better Protestant. If a Protestant he often becomes indifferent. Moral ties are loosened with the religious. The intervening process which occurs here between his abandoning the old state of things and fitting himself to the new, is not favorable to morals or character."

To make the new-comer in time a useful citizen sound reason would dictate to strengthen as far as possible the influence of religion over him, to shield him from temptations peculiar to his condition as a stranger, and to make him confide in those who had been his trusted and best guides. But unfortunately the very opposite course was adopted; Protestant clergy and laity, individually and by means of societies, often ostensibly for charitable objects, but always proving to be proselytizing when you come to scrutinize their work, as well as by means of schools, by ridicule, mockery, caricatures, and sneers, sought first and foremost, at all times and seasons, to weaken the faith of the Irish Catholic, to make him ashamed of his religion, unmindful of the dictates of his own conscience and the counsels of his clergymen, indeed, as Brace says, "a worse Catholic without being a better Protestant." The influence of this system on our separated brethren themselves has been mischievous. It has led them to hesitate at no falsehood or calumny where Catholics are concerned, to falsify statistics, to give a false coloring to the most innocent things, in fact to lower the standard of truth in an incalculable degree, and in the lower classes to produce much vice and crime. Men and women who prided themselves on their exalted Christian character gave time, money, influence to this terrible work, which has wrought incalculable evil to the



country. While they congratulated themselves in their coteries and reports on the good they were doing, they were, in fact, building up a criminal class, devoid of religion and conscience, who though they lost religion yet kept through life a deadly hatred of those to whom they ascribed its loss.

We speak of their work as past; but it is still going on, as it has gone for years. In many States the penal and eleemosynary institutions are proselytizing houses where every Catholic is deprived of means of worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience, deprived of means of instruction in his own faith, and of the consolation afforded by the ordinances of his Church, compelled to learn a system of religion repugnant to him, and to join in its exercises. This makes the victims certainly worse Catholics or no Catholics at all, but it never makes them sincere Protestants, and they escape or are discharged from these houses, at last, with a sense of wrong and a desire of vengeance.

Thousands of emigrants with their moral sense thus dulled, taught hypocrisy, or finding themselves objects of contempt, met two temptations. First, the unchecked and unlimited sale of liquors of the worst and most dangerous character, was urged on them at every turn, and at last it was as a lethean draught to stifle what conscience remained. Their convivial character, ignorance of the real nature of the liquors, all led them on. Brawls, assaults, petty riots, degradation followed, and these offences, great in numbers though not in degree, make the Irish present a formidable appearance in our criminal returns. Unfortunately the influence of liquor extended to their poor homes, and the result was terrible. Among a people naturally affectionate and kind the wife would be struck down in death by her husband. The innocent girl whom he wooed in an Irish village with a heart as guileless as his own, whom he married before the altar, seeking strength from God through the Sacraments of the Church, lies murdered at last in America by his own hand.

And yet before the judgment-seat of God, some of that blood-guilt rests on those who bent all their higher cultivation, their wealth and social influence to weaken the religious influence in that man's soul, and expose him to unguarded temptation.

The elective franchise proved another bane. Politicians welcomed him and used him; while cajoling him with high-sounding phrases, they degraded him into a mere party tool, and unprincipled men without conscience or religion were raised to office by the votes of Irish Catholics, giving deep offence to the better portion of the community. The political meetings, the inevitable bar-room, the corruption of our whole system, with its primary meetings, its caucuses, its false registries, ballot-stuffing, falsifica-

tion of returns, all tended to deaden every sense of virtue and honesty. Men trained in this school soon ceased to approach the Sacraments or even to enter the Church to hear Mass. Religion and its ministry became powerless to control or guide them, till perhaps grace in some moment of trial touched their hearts.

While these causes tended to destroy the male emigrant, the female portion of the new-comers had their special dangers. Though even their enemies admit that "the Irish female laboring class are well known to be at home one of the most virtuous in the world," their very innocent and unsophisticated nature made them more easily duped. Most of them were young inexperienced girls, exposed on shipboard, in the boarding-house where they sought a temporary home, and in the houses where they sought service, to the wiles and even violence of unprincipled men. That some would fall was to be expected, but the number on the whole was comparatively small.

The German emigration, which came later, was not to so great a degree of the poorer peasant class; it contained a far greater number of families, and of trained artisans, persons of some education, entitled in their own country to practice certain trades or branches of commerce. Fewer girls came apart from their families. United in language the German Catholic and non-Catholic supported each other, and were less easily influenced by the proselytizer, who excited the scorn of the German free-thinker, and found himself what he too often made the Irish Catholic, the butt of ridicule. • The unprincipled politician found it less easy to manage a German than an Irish body of voters.

The German Catholics have shown more eagerness for knowledge, supporting schools, periodicals, and papers to an extent that is not only creditable to them, but really a reproach to English-speaking Catholics.

An Italian emigration, which, since the new order of things has obtained in the peninsula, flows in upon us, is by no means healthy. It contains a large element that belonged to the dangerous class in their own country; that has introduced a new kind of bondage, the *padrone* system; is imbued with the communistic theories and vices, and is utterly at variance with the principles of order and submission to divine authority, on which the communities forming this country were founded.

In fact, besides the regular emigration of honest people seeking to secure by industry comfortable homes in this country, there is a steady criminal emigration. New York, the great centre of emigration, sought to check this invasion, but its system has been declared unconstitutional, and the country is comparatively unprotected. Some European states at one time endeavored actually

to empty their prisons on our shores. Even now, to cite the words of the Prison Association of New York: "The professional criminals of the whole civilized world would make New York a rendezvous. The British cracksmen and thieves, the professional thieves from France, Italy, and Germany, and various classes of persons who have lived by crime in Europe, organize crime and live by it in New York."<sup>1</sup>

The increasing method and system in Europe for watching those known to be inclined to commit crime, with the constant supervision exercised over suspicious characters, make them readily seek a refuge in this country, where the criminal classes enjoy such immunity, and so easily escape the punishment due their misdeeds.

Yet, although New York has a larger proportion than many States of foreign population, nearly sixty-one per cent. of the prisoners in the penitentiaries during the year 1877 were native born, showing, says an official report, "that the foreign born inhabitants are no longer chargeable with the great excess of common crimes which is sometimes attributable to them in this State."

In California and on the Pacific coast generally, the children of the poorer classes find themselves cut out from employment by the introduction of Chinese labor. This element has the attractiveness of cheapness, but it will be excessively dear to the country, if it increases, as it has, the native born idle and criminal class. Were it a pure element, healthy in body and in morals, it would be bad enough, but it is essentially demoralizing, if we are to credit those who have studied it in California, and who base their judgment on what they have seen there with their own eyes—a very different criterion from acquaintance with better classes in China. Congress recently passed a law to check to some extent the future emigration of Chinese, and though the act was returned by President Hayes with his veto, the subject will certainly come up again.

It is a difficult question to deal with under our system of government, but the fact remains that the Chinese element introduces new forms of vice, and tends to augment the number of the unemployed, and increase their temptations to crime.

Our great cities have corrupting influences of their own, and none perhaps greater than the overcrowded tenement houses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Records show that the proportion of foreign-born criminals is not only in excess; but the crimes against property are connected with that class of prisoners that seem to have floated into this State as criminals, that is, the cracksmen and burglars.—Thirty-second Annual Rep. P. A. of N. Y., p. 83.



The high prices of real estate of late years, caused by the inflation of paper money, made it impossible for the poor to secure any homes except in these houses. Their work was in the cities and they had to reside there. Even at the lowest rates of commutation, it took too much money and too much time for the working-man to venture to live in the country where he could have a small cottage, for what two rooms cost him in New York. Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities encouraged the erection of cheap houses for the working class, by offering premiums for the best and most reasonable plan; but the movement has not been general.

Although there are cases, and by no means few, where families living in these conditions retain their early religious and moral tone, and bring up their children properly, we must on the whole admit that tenement-house life has been the great hotbed of vice. Where these structures abound liquor saloons abound, in which the vilest compounds are sold. Intoxication and the vices that follow in its wake, are a constant spectacle. Men, women, and children, who enter these houses, soon become habituated to vice in every form. Women, girls lose all modesty and shame, and in a few years sink to the lowest depths.

It need not be said that with overcrowding such as this, there is always disease and, as naturally, crime. The privacy of a house is undoubtedly one of the most favorable conditions to virtue, especially in a girl.

But in New York, in 1868, the number of the tenement-houses was 18,582, containing a population estimated at five hundred thousand, one-half of all living on the island.

If a female child be born and brought up in a room of one of these tenement-houses, she very early loses the modesty which is the great shield of purity. Personal delicacy becomes almost unknown to her. Living, sleeping, and doing her work in the same apartment with men and boys of various ages, it is wellnigh impossible for her to retain any feminine reserve, and she passes almost unconsciously the line of purity at a very early age.

The boys thrown with thieves, and pickpockets, and criminals of deeper dye, hear their vaunts, and begin to admire them. The police authority becomes something to be defied. Many become petty thieves, truants, street-rovers, beggars.

Of the younger criminals in our prisons, a very large percentage begin life in the crowded tenement-houses, where the only home was a room, and the only play-ground the streets.

The public schools are maintained by the taxes levied on all, and should, it might be supposed, afford a means for the children of the poor occupants of such places to acquire an education, and fit them for self-support; but in point of fact the public schools repel as far

as possible the children of the very poor. They have become schools for the children of the wealthier classes, whose parents do not wish them to associate with the children of tenement-houses. What is done for this class is done almost entirely by the Catholic parochial schools; and in New York within a few years Trinity Church has extended widely its schools to take in those virtually excluded from the public schools.

The course of study in these State institutions is peculiarly unfitted to the children of the poor. It is adapted to the children of the middle and wealthy classes, and is in no respect a suitable preparation for a life of toil.

It makes the young discontented, ashamed of their parents, and eager for show and display, and is all the more dangerous as no religious influence exists, no word of heavenly things, of higher or nobler aims than this world, is ever imparted.

The son of the mechanic trained there is ashamed to learn a trade. He has been taught to look higher. If even better influences have prevailed, and he seeks at last to learn a trade, new difficulties await him. Trades-unions exist in almost every branch of business, and these dictate to employers, and prevent the engagement of apprentices. Union men cannot, by the rules of these tyrannical associations, work in a shop where more than a certain number of boys are kept. The consequence is that in many trades the willing boy finds the door closed upon him. Anxious to acquire the means to enable him to earn a livelihood, he finds that no one will or dare receive him. He has perhaps learned to play on the piano, or has acquired a smattering of so-called intellectual philosophy or the derivation of words at the public school, but he has not learned how to handle a tool, or acquired a single idea that will enable him to earn his living by the labor of his hands. The boy who has learned his trade in his foreign home, steps into the shop as a worker, while the boy born among us, though eager and willing to work, has to stand idle, and in this idleness falls a prey to vice. Thus the public school becomes as regards this class of boys a school for tramps and desperadoes.

One who has labored among the homeless boys of one of our large cities, says that the task of reformation was for a time disheartening, difficulties presenting themselves that were unexpected in boys of tender years. "There seems to be a spirit of adventure among them that will not hesitate at incendiarism, and will at times prompt them to present a loaded revolver for some fancied offence. Their ideas are communistic to an extreme degree, and they will assuredly pull down houses about our ears, if not repressed seasonably and with determination." "These boys are not acquainted

with fear, have sometimes to learn the sanctity of an oath, and look on the laws of society as enacted for their oppression."<sup>1</sup>

This result has been gradual. The boy who is spirited and full of adventure, has the elements which ought to make him a good and valuable member of the community; but, trained in a school where religion is excluded, finding avenues for self-support cut off, his aspirations to help a widowed mother perhaps checked, he feels that he and she are alike wronged by society, and, leaving her in her wretched room in a tenement-house, he takes to the street. In many cases he plunges into vice; occasionally he falls under the control of those who will endeavor to save him by implanting sound religious principles in his head and heart, but if a Catholic he frequently here becomes a prey to the hypocritical proselytizer. Children's Aid Societies and similar associations which, when seeking money, disclaim all sectarian or proselytizing intentions, boast among themselves, and occasionally in their reports betraying their inborn hate of the Catholic religion, of the number of Catholic children whom they have removed from all Catholic influence. Benevolence is only a mask, proselytism is the soul, kept alive by an undying hatred of Catholic truth. Let any one collect the reports of the various so-called benevolent associations, and go through them carefully, and he will at once see distinct indications.

So convinced are Catholics of the bad faith of all these movements, of the utter want of principle underlying them, as criminal in itself as the crimes they pretend to remedy, that they are compelled to stand aloof and do what they can in their own way, forced to combat the increasing vice and crime and at the same time counteract as far as they can the efforts of those who, sooner than see a Catholic on the downward path saved by the influence of his religion, move heaven and earth to extirpate all sense of that religion from his heart.<sup>2</sup>

The civil war, which so recently desolated our land, contributed in no small degree to a general increase in crime. The hundreds of thousands of workmen called away from factory and bench to the excitement of army life, with its long periods of inactivity, underwent a training that made to many the old life of steady habits, dull and insupportable. Many there acquired habits of vice, and a dis-

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of St. Vincent's Home for Boys. Brooklyn, 1878.

<sup>2</sup> Brace, in his "Dangerous Classes," attempts to deny the charge of proselytizing brought against the Children's Aid Societies, and says: "Both Catholic and Protestant homes were offered freely to the children," but his work and the reports teem with violent abuse of the Catholic clergy and Church, and in all the correspondence given as from children sent West, we have been unable to find one from a Catholic child in a Catholic family; and we may well hesitate to believe until lists are given that we can examine.



regard of the lives and property rights of others. Many came back who had passed through the ordeal unscathed, yet with seeds of disease enervating their system, rendering steady work impracticable. During the war, as the currency was inflated, there was great activity in many branches of trade, artisans from other parts filled the places of those who were enlisted or drafted, and when they returned, many could not find employment; then as money resumed its old channels, years of financial distress came, and factory and workshop stood idle, leaving two sets of workmen unemployed. Men roamed from place to place seeking work. Accustomed to be away from their families, domestic ties were broken, men became alienated from their wives and children, and easily caught at any pretext to escape responsibility for their support. Failing to secure work they became tramps and vagrants, and the whole country is overrun by armies of these men, who grow more lawless day by day, often congregating in numbers sufficient to plunder railroad trains or small communities.

"As we utter the word *tramp* there arises straightway before us the spectacle of a lazy, shiftless, sauntering or swaggering, ill-conditioned, irreclaimable, incorrigible, cowardly, utterly depraved savage," says Professor Wayland. "He fears not God, neither regards man. Indeed he seems to have wholly lost all the better instincts and attributes of manhood. He will outrage an unprotected female, or rob a defenceless child, or burn an isolated barn, or girdle fruit trees, or wreck a railway train, or set fire to a railway bridge, or murder a cripple, or pilfer an umbrella, with equal indifference, if reasonably sure of equal impunity. Having no moral sense he knows no gradations in crime. He dreads detection and punishment, and he dreads nothing else."

"Recent investigations by the State detective force of Massachusetts have led to the conclusion that the great body of tramps are professional thieves. Moreover, these officials have reason to believe that such vagrants are formed into organized gangs, under the direction of skilful leaders, with general headquarters in the western part of the State, where their plunder is deposited and divided."<sup>1</sup>

In the railroad riots a few years since the country was appalled to see what armies of tramps seemed to gather, as if by magic, ready for any deed of violence; and a general sense of the danger menacing society prevailed. Yet the matter has been allowed to drop out of sight, and no adequate remedy has been undertaken.

---

<sup>1</sup> Papers on Outdoor Relief and Tramps, pp. 10, 15.

The war threw upon their own resources the slave population of the South, which, in bondage, had been compelled to labor while able, and in sickness and age was supported. Emancipation left them free to avoid labor, and they had never felt any obligation to support their aged or infirm relatives. Crime increased among them to a fearful extent, and some forms, especially of violence to women, seemed to come from some organized system, directing it either from the South or the North. Politics, too, drew even those disposed to work away from the paths of industry, and the harangues of unscrupulous politicians inflamed their minds, while liquor freely given contributed to ruin them. A criminal class, or criminal-breeding class was at once formed, which is increasing and at times overawes the well-disposed colored men.

The increasing irreligion of the poorer classes is seen to be at the bottom of almost all the increase of vice. It is due to the vicious nucleus, to the unchecked selling of liquor, to the corrupting influence of politicians, to the license given to houses of ill-fame, to the crowding in tenement houses, and to the course of unscrupulous proselytizers.

If any clearheaded social scientist ever puts to himself the question, "Does proselytizing pay?" his answer will be that it is sowing the storm to reap the whirlwind, and that it is one of the greatest curses of the American social system.

This hostility to our faith, and the proselytism which this hostility engenders and which in turn engenders it, must also be taken into consideration as one of the causes of crime. That we Catholics suffer by it is not all. It blinds many of our separated brethren to all considerations of truth and honor, to respect for the good name and property of others. Led away by this hatred, which so far as they personally are concerned is baseless, for they have no wrongs suffered at our hands, they think everything allowable, so long as it is employed against the Catholic Church, and that everything done or attempted by Catholics must be thwarted.

The facility with which men and women of education, and one would suppose animated by some feelings of Christianity, were led to countenance, circulate, and defend such impostures as *Maria Monk*, *Six Months in a Convent*, *The Escaped Nun*, and similar books, replete with falsehood and immorality, shows that respect for truth and morality was for the time lost. They injured us in our good name, but they injured those who circulated them far more. To connive at falsehood, in one case, lowered their general respect for truth. It made social and commercial falsehood all the more easy. A man who can aid in circulating a lie will easily tell one.

The constant use of insulting names applied to us, "Romanist,"

"Romish," "Popish," and the like, shows a disregard for our good name, in that it endeavors to degrade us in the eyes of our fellow-men. Those who use these epithets will soon go further; they will prevent a Catholic from getting employment solely on the ground of his religion, and will strain a point to lower his good name to effect the end. The point is soon reached where the robbery or burning of Catholic property, if not stimulated by words and connived at, is secretly exulted over. And these cases are not rare. A million of dollars probably will not cover the amount of Catholic property destroyed in this country by open violence or midnight incendiaries, within comparatively few years. Yet we are not to look upon the coarse and illiterate creatures of the lower classes as the real criminals. We must, in truth, look to church-going people, from whom the impulse came. And here, again, the loss we sustain is not all. Those who give the impulse, and those who do the deed, alike have made a terrible step in disregarding the rights of property and of life. What they feel justified in doing to Catholics they will soon feel justified in doing to any one.

And the poor wretch who, hounded on by "No Popery" harangues, puts the torch to a Catholic church or convent, will be ready to apply it to the house or factory of any one whom he is led to regard as an oppressor of him or his class.

Those who lend their influence to deprive Catholics of the right of attending their own worship and receiving instruction from clergy of their own faith, have lost much of their respect for the rights of others, and will be ready to join in some other scheme for depriving men of those liberties for which our ancestors fought a century ago.

In this way this spirit has been a source of crime, begetting a disregard for the right of every man to his good name, his property, and his life. Lower the moral tone of a community in regard to one point, and you open the floodgate. There can be no doubt in any thinking mind that much of the moral decline in the whole nation is traceable to this source. It has falsified the conscience of our separated brethren to an incalculable extent. They never seem to consider at one glance the injury done us, and most assuredly never reflect for an instant on the terrible wrong which they are committing against their own moral nature and that of their children, whom they imbue from the cradle with such distorted moral ideas.

Our Catholic population contains a large proportion of the poorer classes: the rest of the poor are fast losing all religion. The State and public opinion seem alike determined to prevent any definite religious ideas obtaining among them. A kind of heathen morality is all that is permitted to be inculcated, which by its very



negation of every essential element of Christianity renders it powerless for good.

Our relation as Catholics to the condition of our poor, what is to be done to save what is still healthy, what is to be done to reclaim the lost, are subjects that must henceforth demand more general attention than they have hitherto received. Our difficulty will be all the greater as we shall find the power of the State and the influence of Protestant denominations constantly arrayed against us, and really aiding vice instead of encouraging us to suppress it. This is a hard thing to say, and yet every Catholic at all interested in the matter knows that there is no disguising the fact. For instance, in New Jersey, the Catholic boys and girls in the State Reform School are not allowed to be instructed in their religion, attend its worship, or receive its ordinances; they are forced to take part in Protestant worship and receive Protestant religious instruction. The Catholics established a reformatory of their own, but the State refuses to charter it, to confide Catholic children to it, or aid it at all in its good work. The State virtually says: "We are in the hands of proselytizers, and proselytize we shall as long as we can. We do not really care about reform, but so long as we can root Catholicity out of the hearts of these unfortunates, we are satisfied. This is one of the ends for which our government was established."

What exists in New Jersey exists elsewhere. In Massachusetts it was decided within the last year that the wife of a keeper of a poorhouse was a public officer by law, entitled to remain at the bedside of a dying Catholic and prevent her making her confession to a priest, and that the priest on attempting to exclude her from the room was a criminal, as liable to arrest and punishment as the drunken vagabond who knocks down a quiet citizen on the street.

In New York the forcing of Catholic boys to attend Protestant religious service led to a revolt, and though the Catholic Union used every effort to have the cause of discontent removed, the boys were punished and the inhuman bigots escaped even censure.

To consider now what Catholics have done and are doing, we find much to console as the work of a few, and much to give us pain as showing neglect on the part of our community in general. We do not see our wealthier and more influential men taking part in any movements to meet any of the wants which so strongly appeal to us as Catholics and as American citizens, and on the successful remedying of which the future well-being of our country depends. We see one of the great daily papers of the Union constantly giving advice to the Catholic hierarchy, clergy,

Religious Orders, secular and regular clergy, occasionally instructing the Sovereign Pontiff in regard to dogma and discipline; but though the proprietor is a millionaire, and at least nominally a Catholic, as his father was, we do not find that he has ever established any great Catholic charity, or been prominent in inaugurating any movement to help Catholic distress or save Catholics from moral and physical ruin. He is but one of a class. Yet we think that, by proper means, our leading citizens could be induced to take part in organizations similar to those for which our Protestant fellow-citizens find no difficulty in obtaining active co-operation. There is a certain timidity in our prominent men that seems almost moral cowardice, and the silence of Catholic members in municipal and educational boards, in legislative bodies, contrasts most unfavorably with the frank, free attitude of Catholic members in similar situations in England. Yet, if they felt that they were not in a manner isolated, we think that a more manly course would be adopted when they found that they were supported by numbers and respectability.

Certain it is that to meet the great moral wants, we must take action as a body. In the benevolent movements of the day, we cannot, as we have shown, take part, without in reality warring on our religion and convictions; and it is almost hopeless yet to expect our separated brethren to look at this question in the light of truth and honesty, or to stop the long-pursued course of tampering with the faith of Catholics. We can convert criminals much more readily.

In our desire to look well in the eyes of our fellow-men, we have been led away to erect churches that have been too costly. They are grand, and add dignity to religion, it is true, but the necessity of raising money to pay the absolutely necessary portion of the cost, and of meeting the annual interest on the mortgage debt, makes attendance at our churches a heavy tax on the poorer Catholics in many parts. A large expensive church holding but a comparatively small number is a great embarrassment to a zealous priest sent to such a parish. In our large cities there are many districts where hundreds of the faithful cannot, without great difficulty, assist at Mass or hear instructions. Yet, if we are to keep alive faith and religion in the hearts of the poor as the best guard against the temptations that surround them, we must have more and plainer churches for the poor, where the amount they can contribute will meet all the necessary expenses, if it is not possible to make them absolutely free. Here is a field for the generous Catholic who feels that he should make some return to God for the wealth lent to him, lent to him to traffic with till his Master comes. There are districts in every one of our large cities where a few

thousand dollars would secure and even endow a plain church that would afford hundreds of Catholics means of salvation. Let any one in New York start at the Battery, and proceed along the East River, and he will see the truth of this. He will go a mile in the lower part of the city before he reaches a Catholic Church, and then find one densely crowded, with schools attached, most creditable indeed, but both church and school requiring relief. And yet in this part of the city there are more Catholics than in some of our dioceses which have numbers of priests, churches, and institutions.

Cross the river to the great Catholic cemetery, and see what recalls the words of Job: "For now I should have been asleep and still, and should have rest in my sleep, with kings and consuls of the earth, who build themselves solitudes," for here, indeed, are solitudes worthy of kings, monuments simply of human pride costing thousands upon thousands of dollars. The thought can but come, how much nobler a monument a man might raise by erecting, at the cost of such a useless structure, a church in a poor densely populated neighborhood, where the Holy Sacrifice would be constantly offered for his soul, and the prayers of the poor, saved by it from the moral ruin that threatened themselves and their children, would rise day by day as a sweet incense to heaven.

To relieve our overcrowded churches and give the poor every means of practicing their religion and obtaining the encouragement and strength it can give, is the first step.

Providing for the Christian education of their children, we are undoubtedly doing to an extent that is simply wonderful. The number of our parochial schools in all parts of the country bears no mean ratio to those maintained by the State in the interest of the Protestant denominations, though, to some extent, at our expense.

But our poor are crowded in tenement houses, and they and their children are exposed to all the deleterious influences of those unhappy buildings. Places of entertainment for the more advanced, and play-grounds for the children, where all that is improper can be excluded, are necessities. Separate play-grounds for boys and girls, connected with the parochial schools, are a real want. The children of the tenement houses have no play-ground but the street, where they mix with the most vicious element. If ground could be obtained where they would be under good influence great evil would be avoided.

To afford the young men some place where they can enjoy innocent recreation, and thus be under no temptation to frequent the saloon, or the political hall, which is generally connected with a bar, is another want. Very successful attempts have been made in several places to supply this want. The present Bishop of



Rochester, when Rector of the Cathedral in Newark, established a Catholic Institute, in which there was a reading-room and a small library, a gymnasium, ball-alley, tables for innocent games, a room for public lectures and other conveniences. The amount of good effected was at once visible. Young men whose homes were crowded or confined, or who had but a small room in some boarding-house, here found recreation and congenial company, free from any temptation to intoxication or vicious indulgence.

The Church of the Assumption, in Brooklyn, has now, by the exertions of the Rev. William Keegan, a fine building of this character, with rooms for the meetings of the various societies connected with the church, bath-rooms, and rooms for practicing music; everything to attract the young, who justly feel proud of it and benefit by its advantages.

Among the first to recognize the advantages of such institutions are the city authorities, who soon note the influence they exert for the general well-being. In the occasional outbreaks of labor against capital, where many by the tyranny of unions, or by bad example, are led to violence, and after having been for years steady, respectable mechanics, find themselves denizens of a prison along with abandoned criminals, such institutions are a haven of salvation to the unemployed. They can scarcely be too much multiplied in our large cities, where the temptations are the greatest.

Besides the children who come to our parochial schools, there are many who are orphans and many whose parents are worse than dead—dead to God, religion, virtue. Our orphan asylums gather up many of the first class, instruct and fit them to obtain situations, and place them, fortified by good sound training, in positions to earn a decent living. Great as the numbers received in the asylums are, there are still many left unprovided, who join the class of those deprived of home by the vice of their parents, or who, learning vice, defy parental control.

"Vast numbers of these young creatures," said the New York Society for the Protection of Destitute Roman Catholic Children, in its first appeal, "vast numbers are daily wandering over the face of this great city, exposed to all the horrors of hopeless poverty, to the allurements of vice and crime, in every disgusting and debasing form, bringing ruin on themselves." "It is true we have our orphan asylums, our parochial schools, our Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, all of which are giving relief to the utmost extent of their capacity. Yet the amount of juvenile delinquency and wretchedness is hardly diminished; the full tide of destitution and destruction still flows on, and seems likely soon to be swollen by a new current." "We can certainly do something to arrest it. As Catholics, we have the motive; as men, we have the means."

Though their protectory now contains two thousand three hundred children, the appeal is still true as an utterance of the present day.

Voluntary refuges were needed. The Rev. G. T. Haskins established his House of the Angel Guardian in Boston, and similar establishments have been organized in various parts. But the number is too small and the tendency is, perhaps—whether wisely or unwisely—to create very large central establishments, rather than more numerous local institutions. In 1872 the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul established a home for boys in New York, which, under the Rev. John C. Drumgoole, has been very successful. Brooklyn has a similar one, under the Rev. Mr. Hickey. The aid furnished such an institution is a solid investment, certain of producing a large return. After years of experience this clergyman says: "No class of children can be more readily brought under the influence of our holy religion than the homeless and destitute children. They have their faults, but they cannot be blamed, for these faults are to be attributed to the pernicious example of parents, who being a disgrace to religion themselves, by the lives they lead, deprive their children of all means of bettering their condition, either spiritually or temporally. The remark has been made more than once that these poor children cannot be reclaimed because they inherit the bad qualities of their parents. This, from experience, I most positively deny, and do so on the authority of these little fellows themselves, who, with tears in their eyes, deplore the low and vicious habits of their degraded parents."

The establishment of reformatories and homes is a matter of necessity, and as Catholics we must make sacrifices to save these young people, for neither as Catholics nor as Americans can we allow them to go to destruction and become a scourge to the country.

While the sectarian associations work on the principle of breaking all family ties, our Catholic institutions try to strengthen them, and the reclaimed boy, though often persecuted by degraded parents, is sometimes the instrument of their reform.

The Sisters of Mercy, as one great object of their institution, have refuges for girls whose virtue is endangered, and in their institutions in various parts of the country have done incalculable good; but as a community we seem to do little to aid them in their saving work. In their visits to prisons they afford Catholics fallen into crime means of amending their lives and certainly produce good results; although it has to be admitted that many of the convicts become incorrigibly wedded to a life of dishonesty. It is a startling and terrible statement of a clergyman long connected with the Albany Penitentiary, that while men are often reclaimed by re-

viving their religious faith and its influence, it is almost impossible to make any impression on the hearts of women who have become criminals.

For those who have been led astray, but have not committed crimes punishable by State law, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd make it their peculiar field to labor. Religion here appeals in all its force, and reformation is effected with a solid basis, giving every hope of a future virtuous life. To those who feel that the world presents too many dangers, a permanent home under a religious rule is offered, and they are enabled to support themselves by their industry, free from all danger.

Foundling asylums, too, afford to many unmarried mothers shelter and encouragement to reformation.

For the aged poor the Little Sisters of the Poor have asylums as their sole and special object; and Sisters of Charity and other Communities make it in various places one of the objects of their care.

Our Catholic institutions, not always sufficiently attracting the interest and encouragement of our Catholic people at large, are thus constantly meeting many of the crying wants of our time. But the tenement houses as hotbeds of sin and misery remain almost untouched. The visits of Priest, of Sisters of Charity and of Mercy to the sick are not enough. Those of the members of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul can do little to palliate the general evil or make a very permanent impression. The movement begun in some cities to seek legislative action to limit the number of tenants in one building, has thus far dealt more in rhetoric and fine phrases than in anything having any appearance of a system of providing better homes for the poorer classes. These must live, and they prefer life in a city, where they can obtain employment, to life in the country. Mere encouragement to go West, breaking asunder family ties by separating husband and wife, or parents and children, is not a step that can be ultimately beneficial. The country is wide enough and varied enough to afford means of livelihood for all; but many of the poor are unskilled and ignorant of means of support. There seems to be an opening for some Religious Order, like the Benedictine or Franciscan, to begin as they did in Germany or California, making a monastic establishment, with its church and school, as a centre, and selling lands around to poor families drawn from the cities, who can be aided and guided till they are self-supporting, thus building up a Catholic settlement and giving employment to mechanics as well as agriculturists. In the colonization schemes that are from time to time inaugurated, none have looked especially or mainly to the salvation of the inhabitants of our overcrowded city tenement houses, yet there would seem to



be no insurmountable difficulty in obtaining land enough to make the attempt, and to obtain such legislative sanction as would, to a great extent, keep intemperance from destroying the good work. The Methodists at Ocean Grove and Asbury Park, New Jersey, have thus prevented all sale of liquor, and insured in those settlements freedom from intoxication and the evils that follow in its train.

Some of the Southern States offer land as cheap and healthier than the West, where market-gardening for the North is highly remunerative, and smaller farms could be made to give support.

But we Catholics cannot remain in apathy. The increase of crime and of the criminal classes is such as to excite universal alarm, and despite all that has been done and is doing its increase is more rapid than our present means of checking it. Where in our city parishes zealous Religious come to give a mission or retreat, hundreds come to the confessional and make their peace with God, who, living within sound of the church bell, have been strangers for many years to all that religion can give; but though the conversion is sincere, they go back to the same temptations, the same allurements, and the newly acquired habit of virtue is too weak, the path of duty is too difficult, there is no hand to encourage in the moment of weakness, and they fall back.

Thousands can be saved if we can give them healthier surroundings.

The communistic organizations, ramifying throughout the country, will involve many and will bring untold woe on all. The Molly Maguire murders, in Pennsylvania, show that ignorant Catholics can be led into such organizations, and they undoubtedly will, there and elsewhere. Religion alone can save them, and it has to be brought home to them till they feel its influence. In those mining districts many have expiated on the gallows crimes of which they were the reluctant instruments. There are others as weak, who, if withdrawn from evil association there, might elsewhere become useful members of society.

To help the poor in our great cities, whose numbers and whose dangers are increasing, and to save their children is one point that needs concerted action on the part of Catholics generally. Whether by special associations or otherwise, we must give them more churches, facilitate removal to healthier spots, and secure means of livelihood.

The scattered Catholics in the rural districts are exposed to dangers of their own, dangers more especially of a gradual dying out of the faith. They should be aided to concentrate. Both feel the constant war on their faith and need popular cheap books to meet the objections to Catholics and their religion, or to religion of any kind. These should be clear, bright, pointed, and

less defensive than aggressive. The assailants are generally deplorably ignorant and can be easily met. They try to make the Catholic ashamed of his religion, and undoubtedly many are lost to us, who, looking rather to the opinion of men than of God, are ridiculed out of their faith. We should give these help, and strengthen their faith, and enable them to turn the shafts of ridicule on the incongruities, absurdities, and real irreligion of their persecutors.

Our catechetical books, written in other countries, are generally antiquated and defective in form. We need treatises better adapted to our needs to save our young people, and to save them, to keep religion in their hearts is the greatest service we can render our country.

Nor is it among the poorer only that this is the fact. The graduates of our colleges meet in the circles where they move the same temptations, and if they lose the faith, they too are fair candidates for the criminal classes. Our colleges certainly have not produced in the country generally the results we might naturally expect. The graduates have not made their influence felt as have those of the rationalistic institutions, and, in spite of the training they have received, not a few seem to be moral cowards enough to be laughed out of their faith, or at least out of the practice of their religion. We do not find the robust, sturdy, stalwart faith, which, kindled by the enthusiasm of youth, should exert a wide influence and cheer those lower in life, who seeing courage, take heart in turn.

A great Catholic University is a want, but it will require years of preparation to give it a faculty that will meet every branch of science and learning as acknowledged masters, and take issue at once with all the erroneous theories of the day so ably that the students will feel that they are on the victorious side. But whether by associations, publications, or a more general shaping of education to meet our wants, we must strengthen the faith of the poor, and rouse the faith of the rich, choked by the cares and pleasures of this world, or the rapid increase of the criminal element will rob us of our poor and leave our wealthier enervated and helpless.

The great peril of this country approaches, and to us Catholics comes with terrible meaning the question: "Why stand ye here all the day idle?"

Not only must we have more and plainer churches, with ragged schools, if you like, societies to aid the tenement-house poor in obtaining a livelihood in country parts, more extended associations to support reformatories and refuges, but we need higher educational establishments, a great Catholic University that will give us what we lack, a class of thoroughly educated and truly Catholic young men, who will inspire Catholic life in the upper class and by ex-

ample and influence act on the lower class. Unless the Catholics more favored by fortune do not show more of Christian life, and exert a wider and more general influence than they have yet done, they will be swept away in the general irreligion around them, and so far from preserving or reclaiming their poorer brethren, will have to be brought to higher and better thoughts by the examples furnished among their humbler brethren.

On them rests a grave and a great responsibility.

They are called upon by every motive to give time, influence, and exertion to avert the evils which menace us.

---

## ADMISSIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES.

*"Judicibus vel inimicis nostris."*

THE testimony of an unwilling witness, in a civil or criminal court, has deservedly very great weight, and preponderates largely over the evidence of one who has no bias, and still more over the words of those whose eagerness to testify is apparent. This is especially visible in matters pertaining to the doctrine and practice of the Church; for there is frequently manifested among thinkers of the "advanced type," a certain disposition to sneer at even the best and most thoroughly presented arguments of a professed champion in her cause, chiefly through the insinuation that *by this craft he has his livelihood*; and that therefore, whether he really thinks so or not, he is necessarily bound down to present as strong a case as possible, and to smooth over, with his utmost adroitness, the real difficulties of the question. This we well remember to have been the case among very many with whom we were acquainted in early days, who used frequently to assert that "the learned of the clergy of the Romish Church knew better than to believe her doctrines;" but that they merely kept up appearances, making the worse appear the better cause and using their ability simply for personal ends. From this it was easily deducible, and on that conclusion they acted, that they would not read the arguments of Catholic writers, nor would they give heed to the most logical reasoning of well-informed Catholics; and thus it became utterly impossible to bring them to a respectful consideration of the claims which the Church has, particularly upon every bap-



tized Christian, as also upon the whole human race, in regard to their conversion, for which she has her divine mission. Surely this was simply placing themselves beyond the ordinary possibility of salvation, since "*faith cometh by hearing.*" Indeed we know no more striking admission on the part of our adversaries than the tacit one manifested in their craven fear of a well-informed Catholic, and their utter horror of a well-written Catholic work.

We have, therefore, thought it not unlikely that were we to present a few distinctive points of *doctrine* and *practice* in the Catholic Church, merely prefacing them by some introductory remarks and adding a few candid admissions of the more respectable and learned of our opponents, touching the truth of the *doctrinal assertions* and the manifest utility and benefit of the *practical* portion, we might interest some of our readers to make still further collection of evident admissions from our foes, and perhaps open a way for some who grope after truth, since, as above indicated, there are many outside the pale of the Church who would esteem such testimony least liable to be impugned; and thus, by God's grace, they may be brought to the rock-built edifice with which our Saviour has promised to be "*all days.*" Nor is our article aggressive, save in so far as the statements and admissions of Protestants and infidels in favor of the Church of God may deserve that epithet, certainly the aggression comes not from us. True, the Church stands in no need of testimony *ab extra*. Her foundation is sure, being God's promise, which cannot fail; but we have merely jotted down instances which occur *hic et nunc* where Balaam has been forced to bless Israel instead of cursing him, showing how the Almighty makes the wrath of man redound to His praise. Our aim shall have been fully attained, if this faint tracing out of a few of the admissions of the enemies of the Church should induce others to continue the work further and more accurately than duties enable us to do. For we may rest assured that there are many, very many, who may be reached and who can be influenced by arguments presented and coming from such a source, who would not enter a Catholic Church, listen to a Catholic lecture, or pay the slightest attention to the reasoning of the ablest Catholic logician in the world, but who will respond at once to the call of their fellow-religionists, or *non-religionists*, as the case may be. All that we desire is, that they would hearken: for truth will certainly make its way and conquer error, except in the case of the utterly reprobate, but in order to be known, it must first be heard.

It has frequently struck us as quite possible to take up the various admissions of the most reputable among our adversaries, and thence efform an entire system of Catholic theology. We should have to traverse the whole controverted territory of the

creed, since, though article by article, each, in its turn, is by some unhesitatingly admitted, yet by others it is just as earnestly repudiated. The general deduction which we thence make is, that they have always vacillated, and that, *save dislike to the Church*, they have not now, nor have they ever had, any definitely fixed creed. There remains the singular fact that were we to take all the different sects (God's Church is *no sect*), from the earliest ages to the present day: Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, etc., down to the last fungus growth from the latest putrefaction of Calvinism, Arminianism, Socinianism, Quakerism, or Unitarianism, and to question them, point by point, on the Catholic creed, the absolute majority, *among themselves*, would admit the teaching of the Church. This fact, which will bear the most rigid investigation, made a deep impression on that eloquent orator and profound thinker, Edmund Burke, when put before him by a number of his countrymen, who implored him to help them from the yoke of the galling "Penal Laws." "Take," said they, "this hypothesis: Let all professing themselves Christians (save and except the Catholic Church) unite together in council; or let adequate representatives of every sect under the title of Christian, from the beginning of Christianity, be called together and questioned concerning their views or faith, taking up each and every article of the Catholic creed for discussion and decision; the majority of that council would invariably be given for the Catholic faith." Hence, they concluded, "Catholics deserve honest and fair treatment at the hands of every nation regarding itself as Christian."

We might call the attention of the thinker to the semi-occasional convulsive strivings among Protestants after an unattainable unity, exemplified in their Evangelical Alliances, World's Conventions, Pan-Anglican Synods, etc.; since by striving thereafter, even though gropingly and wrongly, they yet thereby admit the *desirableness*, if not the *necessity*, of that unity which is only attainable in the Church of God. Indeed, in returning to the Common Mother, they would hardly have more concessions, than they are obliged to make amid the general divergences of an Evangelical Alliance; nor are they totally unaware of the anomaly of their position, claiming to be followers of Christ, yet radically and permanently divided in doctrine and practice; some of them not even admitting the axiom, "*verum nequaquam quod variat.*"

Of course we speak to and for those who believe in God's word, those whose inmost conviction is that our Saviour meant what He said; and not either for utter infidelity or for those who, professing nominally to believe Holy Scripture, merely accept so much of it as suits them *pro hac vice*. We leave out, therefore, the first Anglicans, Book of Homilies, p. ii. "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned,

all sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom (an horrible and dreadful thing to think on), have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested by God and damnable to men, the space of 800 years and more." What shall we say of such doctrine or of the believers therein? When we consider the promise of Christ, to be with his Church "*all days*." What can the utterers of such sentiments have thought, or their followers now think? Are the plainest words of Holy Writ of any avail, when opposed to their prejudices or preconceived views? Absit blasphemia! But they might as well call the Ruler of the Universe a liar! Arguments, analogy, admissions, from friend or foe, would all be wasted on such beings; nor do we address ourselves to any such. The utter Atheist (did the monster exist), the honest and avowed Infidel, the Mohammedan, or Pagan, might be reached by the truth, but these are, humanly speaking, hopeless.

Still there exists a large number, of all grades of intellect, of all stations in society, and of various degrees of educational culture, who, if they knew the truth, if they could be brought fairly face to face with it, would acknowledge it; but whose surroundings through life hitherto have been of that kind that they have never had the opportunity, and who now, as adults, pass through life, some of them prejudiced against the Church, more of them apathetic towards her, and all of them with an ill-defined general idea that Catholics are vulgar, poor, mostly foreigners, and always superstitious; consequently, that the evidences of their religion are not worth investigating. For these the few hints in this article are thrown out, that finding, on the admission of some of the modern leaders of thought, firm ground existing where they fancied nothing but marsh, they may be induced to drain off some of their former prejudices, and reclaim ground whereon, by the help of God, to build a future edifice of faith. We produce to these the testimony, isolated, it is true, and bearing in each instance on a single point, of profound writers, whose training has rendered them unable to grasp the system of the Church in its entirety. For Almighty God has so arranged, that even our ablest and bitterest opponents have had, at times, lucid intervals of surcease of mental fog, during which they have made admissions entirely suicidal to the various and variegated "schemes of salvation" which spring from Protestantism.

It may be taken for granted that the Church propounds no doctrines for the belief of her members which seem to Protestants, etc., so absurd and incomprehensible as *infallibility and transubstantiation*. If, then, it be found that there are learned and ingenuous Protestants who admit the necessity of the one, and the consonance with Scripture of the other, we may readily imagine that, on other



and less salient points, still larger and more frequent admissions may be expected. We take an instance of each. "In every form of Christianity there *must exist an infallibility* somewhere."—(HUGH MILLER, *First Impressions*, ch. xiii.)

"No doctrine can be more *rigorously defended* both by *Scripture* and by *tradition* than that of *transubstantiation*, but, its consequences proving disastrous to society, it has been found convenient to repudiate it, with *bad reasoning*, but with excellent results."—(*Westminster Review*, art. "Quakerism.")

The latter writer does not condescend to give us anything beyond his own assertion for the *disastrous results* of the doctrine upon society, nor do we propose to set him right in the premises. That with which we have to do is the downright square admission of the truth of the doctrine of the Church in both instances given, and the daily reading of even the most cursory and superficial peruser of the literature of the day fairly bristles with similar grounding of arms on the part of our antagonists. For example, there is nowadays no cry so popular, no motto so distinctive, no howl which so speedily traverses the domain of Protestantism as that of "*the Bible, the Bible only!*" Yet we find two of their most distinguished professors speaking thus :

"Long since it was foretold that we (*Protestants*) should yet be forced to admit the utter insufficiency of individual interpretation of Scripture." The prediction is now fulfilled, since it is Protestantism itself that writes as follows: "Why did we replace a living authority by a dead letter, if we must study the languages of the dead past to understand the Scriptures? The burden is beyond all reason!"—(DR. VON SCHELLING, *Vorlesungen über die akademischen Studien*.)

"The Protestant Church, taking Scripture alone as doctrinal base, is founded on the sand."—(DR. DELBRUCK, *Phil. Melancthon, der Glaubenslehrer*.)

So much being premised, and with the full understanding that our article can at the utmost but shadow out a portion of the coast to be triangulated, since to lay down full charts would require a series of articles in the first place, and the said coast of error being exposed to the full swell of the ocean of truth, in which the tides are high and tidal waves not infrequent, we leave the remainder of the work of survey and sounding to hands and minds less preoccupied. And now for the admissions: first in points of doctrine, which we shall take in this order, viz.:

1. Need of unity of faith, and hence of practice.
2. Necessity of confession and its accord with Scripture.
3. Propriety of prayers for the dead and proofs of their antiquity.
4. Invocation of Saints and its consonance with our wants.

We, as Catholics, know nothing better suited to give manifest proof of the need of unity than the prayer of our Divine Lord in the memorable texts of St. John's Gospel, xvii. 20, 21: "And not

for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in me: that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." It would hardly be possible for ingenuity to change the obvious sense of these words, and the deduction from such visible unity is clearly made: "That they may believe that Thou hast sent me." If to this be added the plain fact here implied and elsewhere announced by our Redeemer, that His work was to continue always, even to the end of time, it will not be difficult to see how imperative are the claims of unity upon Christians. True, this and similar texts of Scripture only have weight with those who admit that Christ, our Lord, came upon earth to found His Church, and actually performed the work; and we write only for such as will admit, at least, so much of divine revelation. Those who do not admit this, and who do not believe either the words or works of Christ, are very little likely to be moved by the admissions of the ablest opponents of Catholicity.

But let us represent to ourselves a reasoning man, who accepts, indeed, the Scriptures, and who has, with great labor, managed to shape out for himself a creed or system of belief from the fragments of revelation within his comprehension. We do not say that such a person exists or ever existed, but, *on Protestant principles, he should exist*; such being the only logical way, according to the doctrines of the *reformers*, in which the individual should attain a knowledge of the way of salvation! But our dissenting brethren, while they deny the principle of authority, and generally contemptuously repudiate infallibility, and while they are absolutely without either unity or certainty in matters of faith, still act practically as though each sect, or fragment thereof, were under infallible guidance, and mainly take for granted that the Almighty is with the sect in which each individual happened to be born, making thus a clear admission of the need of guidance in order to attain a knowledge of the truth. Our supposititious friend then takes his system to be *probable*, on the purely Protestant grounds of research and private opinion. The merely probable has been attained, but he can possess no certitude, save what springs from and is based on his own vain and empty imaginings. Nevertheless, we must suppose that he has been earnestly struggling all along after the truth, unutterably desirous of a knowledge of the doctrine of Christ (which must be *one*) and for infallible certainty. Yet neither he nor his companions, having excogitated a *society*, and calling themselves perchance by the name of "*Church*," will venture the presumption of a claim to infallibility. The very fact that not one of the numerous *soi-disant* "*churches*" has ever straightforwardly

made such a claim (they all do so *by implication*), is not only a broad admission, but a positive proof that none of them possesses it. And this may in some degree explain the fact that with one consent they pour out the vials of their wrath against the Catholic Church, which has always claimed, as logically she must, exclusive possession of this divine prerogative. How, indeed, should a merely human association lay claim to a gift so manifestly divine? The default of claim manifests the lack of title.

Such, and thus instituted, are all the sects; and yet admitting, as they must, that they have no unity, avowing readily their want of absolute certainty, and venturing no claim, logical or otherwise, to be considered exclusively as "*the Church*," they yet presume to put forth formulas, which must be sworn to, and articles innumerable, which must be subscribed and obeyed by all their members. Why do they not come boldly from behind their purely negational and protesting phraseology, saying in words what they all say in deed, viz.: "God has obliged all men to accept the doctrine of our society, but He has by no means promised or pledged himself in any way that our teaching is true! On the contrary, both it and we *may be* entirely wrong; *probably are so*, for we claim no infallibility, and the vast mass of Christendom (to which we are but as a drop in the bucket) is entirely against us." That this is no vagary of the imagination we need only call attention to the various books of Common Prayer, Confessions of Faith, Articles of Belief, Catechisms, Forms of Church Government, and Directories for Worship, all of them differing, and yet to these, despite their want of unity, harmony, or even the slightest meagre certainty that they will remain unchanged for any consecutive three months, every one must subscribe, who joins an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregational, or even a Methodist meeting, thus having his creed fixed upon him, since "in every form of sect there must exist an infallibility somewhere," even though confessedly contradictory.

This admission of lack of unity and want of infallible authority is peculiarly strange and painful, to minds reverting, however briefly, to the splendid certainty of Israel before the coming of the Messiah, now through the promises made to the Patriarchs, now through God-sent men, who spoke without the shadow of doubt, saying, "*Thus saith the Lord*," as Moses, Joshua, and the Judges; anon through the long series of Prophets during the whole of Old Testament times. The Divine presence, moreover, on the mercy seat, the Ephod of the High Priest, transmitting an unquestionable certainty to the inquirer; and the daily sacrifices, manifesting unity of worship, force the candid mind to admit the superiority of Jewish over Protestant times. In short, so far from being obliged thereby to thankfulness for the great goodness of God in redemp-



tion, on Protestant principles, it were far better that our Saviour had not yet come! Nor is there the remotest doubt but that the subdivided condition of disintegrating sects has largely hindered the conversion of Jews and Pagans. Surely, when so much, and that, too, on so grand a scale, was done for the Jews, a fair analogy would lead us to expect that the coming of the Messiah should at least leave Christians no worse off than people were under the old dispensation. Only in the Catholic Church is this completely accomplished, where perfection answers promise, where the sacrifice responds to the type, where the line of priestly succession has its accomplishment, and the real presence of God in the ancient Holy of Holies, is made still more unspeakably tender by the presence of Christ in the sacrifice of His love for man!

To discuss, however, the want of unity of the sects in the broad light of their patent contradictions of each other and of themselves on almost every doctrinal point, becomes still more superfluous in view of their own admissions. Thus, not to say anything of the earlier heresiarchs and writers of the Reformation, who openly contradicted and defied each other, we have the general assertion of the learned Anglican *Bishop of Lincoln* in a charge to his clergy, as follows:

"Our articles and liturgy do not correspond with the sentiments of any of the eminent reformers on the continent, or with the creeds of any of the Protestant churches which are there established."

Whilst *Dudith* in his epistle to Beza, confessed, that

"If that be true which the ancient Fathers professed, then the truth is wholly on the side of the Catholics."

No wonder that *Bishop Horne* expresses the want of unity among them thus strongly:

"The church (*Protestant*) is an indigested mass of contrarieties jumbled together—  
..... a mere chaos."

Of course, under such circumstances, those who are logical, following their own inner light, find themselves in the end Rationalists; whilst a large number, seeing no hope of unity in diversity, return to obey the voice of authority in the bosom of the Church of God. Time would fail us to mention names of those illustrious from station, eminent through ability, and still more distinguished through the graces conferred on them by Almighty God, who have within the past fifty years, both in this country and in Europe, given in the weight of their admissions in favor of God's Truth, from all the varied sects, by casting their lot with the Catholic Church and giving their adhesion to her; and if the duty be not too painful for our adversaries, we would very gently, but with great confidence, ask a comparison of their virtues, holy purposes,

and well-known sacrifices with the motives of those who may have, either lately or at any past time, fallen from the Catholic Church, even though but for a time. Such comparison will assuredly furnish food for thought—neither will the cause of the Church lose thereby!

That Christ our Lord came to save sinners is a truth which all who have the slightest tincture of Christianity unhesitatingly admit, whilst His own assertion that as Son of man He had "power on earth to forgive sins," joined with His actual performance of a visible miracle over sickness to prove His invisible authority over sin (St. Matth. ix., St. Mark ii., St. Luke v.), leave no doubt as to the fact that such forgiveness is within the ambit of His perpetual mission. The promise given by Him to his Disciples covered the whole ground, and the fulfilment of that promise: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx.), leaves nothing to be desired as to its meaning, especially when the practice of the Church and the sense of the earliest and best writers are consulted. The exceeding happiness of having made a good confession is beyond the power of words to describe; and those alone even partially appreciate their blessed condition who, as Catholics, are deeply penetrated with a sense that the power and authority there called into use are entirely divine. It is thus, and thus only, that we dare approach the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, having on the wedding-garment, and having proved ourselves capable of satisfying the Apostolic precept, "to discern the body of the Lord." Listen, however, to the admissions of learned and subtle adversaries on this score:

"The institution of sacramental confession is assuredly worthy of the divine wisdom, and, of all the doctrines of religion, it is the most admirable and the most beautiful. The necessity of confessing sin is sufficient to preserve from it those who still preserve their modesty; and yet, if any fail, confession consoles and restores them. I look on a grave and prudent confessor as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls. His counsels regulate the sentiments, reprove vices, remove the occasions of sin, cause the restitution of ill-acquired property and the reparation of wrongs, clear up doubts, console under afflictions, in fine, cure or relieve all the evils of the soul: and as nothing in the world is more precious than a faithful friend, what is the value of that friend, when he is bound by his functions and fitted by his knowledge to devote to you all his care, under the seal of an inviolable secrecy!"—(LEIBNITZ, *Syst. Theol.*)

"The enemies of the Roman Church who have assailed the salutary institution of confession, appear to have removed the strongest restraints which can be put upon secret crimes. Even the sages of antiquity have felt the importance of it."—(*Annales de l'Empire.*)

"Confession is an excellent institution—a curb to crime, and formed to induce to forgiveness hearts ulcerated by hatred."—(*Quest. Encycloped.*)

"What reparations and restitutions does not confession produce among Catholics!"—(ROUSSEAU, *Emile.*)

"Private confession is of very ancient practice in the Church, and of excellent use and benefit."—(BP. MONTAGUE'S *Appeal.*)

"I am happy, General, that I have fulfilled my duties. I wish you, at your death, the same happiness. I had need of it."—(EMP. NAPOLEON BONAP.)

"There is no doubt that confession is necessary and established by God; but secret and auricular confession, as practiced at this day, in the Church, especially pleases me. It is not merely useful, it is necessary. God forbid that I should wish its abolition! I rejoice that it exists in the Church, because it is the only means to restore peace to troubled consciences."—(LUTHER apud *Ussleber*.)

"Who has not turned a longing eye to the tribunal of penance? Who has not yearned, in the bitterness of remorse and in uncertainty as to the Divine forgiveness, to hear the lips that can say to him with the power of Christ: 'Go in peace; thy sins are forgiven thee?' For myself, if I believed that I had found that supernatural power, which the Church attributes to herself; that power, the precious and unfailing source of reconciliations, restitutions, effectual repentance; of all that God most loves after innocence, standing again by the dying bed of him, whom in the cradle it had blessed, and amid the most pathetic exhortations and the most tender farewells, saying: 'Depart, Christian soul;' if I believed that I had found such a power upon earth, there are often moments, when I would joyfully lay down at its feet that liberty of conscience, which, at times, presents itself much more as a burden than as a privilege!"—(NEVILLE of Geneva.)

"Here shall the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it; after this manner, etc."—(*Anglican Visitation of the Sick*.)

Dr. Pusey and his followers, despite the efforts of most of the prelates of the Anglican Establishment, have advanced so far, that confession is practiced amongst them quite generally in England; and even in this country, it is, as we are credibly informed, far from being unknown among those Episcopalians who are known by the names of High Churchmen or Ritualists! See their missions, preparations for confession, and holy communion, etc.

We come now to the admissions of our dissenting brethren concerning the consoling and touching practice of prayers for the dead, based as are all Catholic practices upon the doctrine of the Church. Assuredly, were there no place of purgatory, there could be no prayers for the dead; since those who are already in heaven do not need, and those upon whom final judgment has been passed, can receive no advantage from our prayers. Certainly, the fact that Israel, in every age, offers prayers, both public and private, for the repose of the dead, has deservedly had great weight with men of thought; and such as are at all versed in history, cannot but admit the fact related in the Book of the Macchabees as historical testimony, where the practice is laid down, with the simple but plain reason added, that "*it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.*" The same fact is daily attested by the ritual of the synagogue and the prayers used by the Rabbis and people for the repose of the departed. The reasonableness of this practice and of the doctrine on which it is based, to say nothing of the authority presented by its antiquity and continuity, is thus admitted by the learned lexicographer, Dr.



Samuel Johnson, who says: "The generality of mankind are neither so obstinately wicked as to deserve everlasting punishment, nor so good as to deserve being admitted into the society of the blessed spirits; and therefore, God is graciously pleased to allow a middle state, where they may be purified by certain degrees of sufferings. You see, there is nothing unreasonable in this." (*Boswell's Life*.) His practice seems to have been consonant with his belief, since it is well authenticated that he prayed regularly for his deceased parents and for his wife. Indeed, what are the numerous current expressions which we read in Protestant literature and hear in daily life: "*May the earth rest lightly upon his remains;*" "*may the sod lie gently upon his bosom,*" etc., but the expression of a natural and instinctive longing felt by all to pray for their dead friends and acquaintances?

"The ancient Fathers speak often of prayers for the dead, and we do not forbid them."—(MELANTHON, *Apology for the Augs. Conf.*)

That learned Protestant Prelate, DR. FORBES, in his discourse on Purgatory, says: "Let not the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the Universal Church of Christ, almost from the very time of the Apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive Church, and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages. The Church Universal has believed the practice not only to be lawful, but likewise beneficial to the souls departed. Let it be granted that this custom was always judged lawful and also profitable by pious antiquity, and most generally received at all times in the Church."

"The universal and apparently apostolical custom of praying for the dead in Christ, is admitted. Further, that the prayers of the living benefit the dead in Christ, is, to say the least, not inconsistent, as USHER shows us, with the primitive belief."—(*Oxford Tracts*, 79.)

Quite lately we were amused by the very ponderousness of an article in the *British Quarterly Review*, where, under the head of "*Contemporary Literature*," the object would seem to be the proof, that "there is an antecedent probability for the existence of a higher order of beings than man;" and the author, under review (*M. Godet, Biblical Studies*), is highly praised as one born in a spot not "stunted by the breath of Roman superstition." The expression, intended to be insulting, is a patent admission of the higher plane on which Catholics move and have their being, and is an unintentional, an unwilling compliment to the Church of God! Wherever such phrases occur, the reader may quite securely prepare himself for weak reasoning; and this was truly a case in point, in which by dint of cogent argument darkness was made eminently visible. It is true, the inference was mainly from analogy, but the labor bestowed was entirely too great for the result dimly and faintly attained by this process, when the fact is so patent from Holy Writ! Of course, for so enlightened a philosopher, the authority of the Church would avail naught! How can the Old or New Testaments

be clearer than they are concerning the existence of spirits, which become specifically *angels*, or *messengers*, when sent upon particular duties? The fact that they are thus occupied, is abundantly apparent throughout the Scriptures; and that they are interested in our well-being, capable of praying for, and of protecting us; that their prayers are offered to the Most High for us, and that the prayers of the Saints ascend through angelic intervention, can be pointed out in the plainest words of inspiration. If we examine the Jewish Liturgies, we shall find regular invocations directed to the Holy Angels, in keeping with the blessing of the dying Patriarch: "May the Angel, who guided me, and kept me from all evil, bless the youth." (*Genesis* xlviii.) The synagogue has always had recourse to the intercession of those of the dead, whom it regarded as saints, and asks the same aid of prayers from angels. (*Harmony of Church*.)

"When it is said that the saints cannot hear our prayers, unless God reveal them to them, so that Almighty God, upon the Roman theory, conveys from us to them those requests which they are to ask back again of Him for us, we are certainly using an unreal, because an unscriptural argument. Moses on the mount, having the sin of his people first revealed to him by God, that he, in turn, might intercede with God for them. Indeed it is through Him (in whom we live, move, and have our being), that we are able in this life, to hear the requests of each other, and to present them to Him in prayer. Such an argument then, while shocking and profane to the ears of a Romanist, is shallow even in the judgment of a philosopher."—(*Oxford Tracts*, 71.)

"We cannot bear too reverent a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not the worship which is due unto God himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive Church: 'Let her be honored and esteemed; let Him be worshipped and adored.'"—(BP. PEARSON, *On the Creed*.)

It will thus be seen that the Church is not without testimony to the truth of her doctrines even from her foes; and it will with equal readiness be perceived that we have only, from the nature of the case, adduced a very few of the admissions under each head; selecting from the vast mass such as seemed most striking, or such as we could most readily lay our hands upon; neither have we gone beyond the record, carefully confining ourselves to such admissions as bore pointedly upon the doctrines intended for presentation in this article.

Having thus cursorily presented a few points of doctrine in regard to the truth of which, some at least of our opponents do not disagree with us, we come next to *matters of practice* among Catholics; in regard to which we shall have to be even more brief than had been at first intended. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says the Apostle, and as practice is a necessary result of doctrine, our sincerity in our belief and the advantages and purity of that belief itself, are best tested by the practices resultant therefrom. But it is so obviously impossible to give, word for word,

quotation for each point, that in this branch of the subject we shall content ourselves with merely indicating generally what the admissions are, and occasionally whence they emanate. Our friends of the opposite side are scant of creed to be sure, and what there is of it is not very fixed; by consequence their round of religious practices is limited; and if a somewhat overstrained outward observance of what they are pleased to term the "*Sabbath*"—a tendency on the part of the more religiously inclined among them to sleep longer on the morning of that day, and to go decorously to hear a "*discourse*"—be taken away, there remains but little in the way of religious practice among Protestants at large. Ah! we forget. There is an annual "*Thanksgiving*," very well observed as a holiday; and we seem to remember sporadic "*Fast-days*," so-called, perhaps, because nobody fasted thereon. Condensing, therefore, as much as in us lies, what remains shall be said in regard to the following heads:

1. The daily opening and the daily service in the Catholic Churches.
2. Charitable institutions, their permanence and dignity in the Church.
3. Religious Orders, and the work accomplished by them.
4. The Priest at the death-bed, and the value of his attendance.
5. Catholic patriotism and loyalty.

It is a frequent subject of remark by Protestants in the United States, and a still more oft-recurring observation of tourists and writers of travel in Europe, that whereas the Protestant and other non-Catholic places of worship are invariably closed, except for a few hours on Sunday, the Catholic churches are on the other hand daily open for adorers, rarely untenanted by them, and that divine service (when there is a priest), is intermitted on no day of the year. In short the "*Meeting-house*" is true to its name and origin, *i. e.*, a place for coming together, not for worship, but to see and be seen, and to hear during half an hour, a display of eloquence on some abstract or current topic, an address to the people under the thin veneer of a prayer to God, or a popular explication of how the book of Genesis may be made to agree with Darwin; or, the Apostle Paul to harmonize with Huxley. Yet in this our dissenting brethren are entirely consistent with themselves; since, as they do not contend that any special benediction rests on the place, it would be difficult to understand why any special reverence for it should be implied. It is merely its size and capacity for accommodating numbers, that render it in any respect different from a private parlor or dining-room.

When the divinely instituted Jewish religion had its Temple, it was recognized as the "*House of God*," and the regard and rever-



ence paid to it was because of the real and actual presence of the Almighty therein. Even now the Synagogue has its "*sacred place*," towards which, in imitation of temple rites, our Hebrew friend humbly bows with the veneration due to the Law of the Most High; and on the Day of the Atonement, the people humbly prostrate themselves with their Rabbi before the casket, whence the spirit has fled.

Pass then into a Catholic church. All sign themselves with the sign of the cross, all make a devout bending of the knee, all eyes turn to the altar, each is absorbed in "that ark of worship undefiled;" and the poor (who have chiefly built the edifice), are not only welcome but they know and recognize the promise that, "*theirs is the kingdom*." And the Church, which does not act on the principle (half-way believed, it would seem, by many Protestants), that the invention of printing is the supplement to the Incarnation, has devotions suited to all her children; for these, the Rosary; for those the Stations of the Cross; there an old man prays at the altar of St. Joseph; yonder kneels a maiden at the altar of the Virgin Mother; while yet another in the distance strikes his breast, and in his heart cries out, "*God be merciful to me a sinner!*" "When I enter a Catholic church," said an eminent Protestant minister to the writer, "and contemplate the reverence, the fervor of devotion, the adaptedness of the Church to the wants of all—learned and uncultured, rich and poor, young and old, I do not wonder that her followers lovingly name her, '*Our Holy Mother, the Church*;' and my heart sinks within me at the thought of our own lethargic services." The portal of the church is open, not on a part of one day of the week, but always, and the living nature of our practice springs directly from a living faith, which commences with the mystery of the Incarnation, goes through the Rosary, in which the life of our Saviour is vividly represented to our minds, and depicts in the Stations of the Cross the Redemption of mankind, bringing it home to us in a way that embraces the whole spirit of Christian prayer. No, the audience-chamber of the house of God is, as it should be, ever easily accessible, and rarely indeed, even in our own country, so noted for hurry, business, and bustle, will the sanctuary be found vacant of worshippers! What a contrast with the meeting-houses! Into these no man can enter, if he would—nobody wants to enter, save for a few hours every seventh day. Why should he? They possess, even according to their frequenters, nothing holy; and we fully admit that from their own standpoint, their frequenters are right. On the contrary, the services of the Church are a complete fulfilment of the morning and evening sacrifices of the Old Law; and real, vivid faith is the key which unlocks the door.

A lively writer, in one of the monthlies, remarks: "*Our Catholic brethren, at least, rise up early!*" Had he continued his investigation he would have discovered not merely that they rise early to go to church, but that their devotion is no mere formal one when there; proving their full assurance that "this is the house of God!" this is truly the house of prayer! How can true Catholics act otherwise in church, since they know that the Author of every grace is really present? True it is, that the poor are the chief worshippers; but *we* have yet to learn that wealth makes a Christian, or that Christ did not foretell that the *poor should be always with us*. Hence they come very naturally to their own house, built by the poor, for the poor; often leaving the fastidious rich far behind them in spiritual graces. "The Church," says Lasteyria, "is the real mother of the poor, and the poor constantly recognize her as such. Stand, as the congregation departs, at the door of any Catholic church, if you wish to certify yourself of the fact. Does the beggar ever station himself at the door of the Protestant church? He places himself, as of right, by that where he recognizes that his appeal will not be disregarded."

One of the Protestant papers lately showed conclusively, and lamented in the *exposé* of the fact, that if by any chance a sudden desire to attend church service were to attack the entire non-Catholic portion of the population of any of our large cities, not *one-tenth* could find church accommodation! We have no means of proving the fact, but his figures carried conviction with them; and had it not been true, it is very unlikely that such a showing would have been made. If so, it looks much like a patent admission that the religions of our dissenting friends are not for the poor. On the other hand, the early stroller on any Sunday morning, in the same cities, can easily satisfy himself that by 8 A.M., several large Catholic congregations have already attended to their religious duties, and retired to give place in turn to others, chiefly of the poor, ere any considerable number of our opposing friends had "*turned side and shoulders, or moved heavy head*." "Why is it," feelingly inquires one of their sectarian papers, "that the zeal and devotedness ever present with Romanists in the practice of a false devotion, should be wanting to us in the performance of true worship?"

How touching, too, is not the devotion of the Angelus, which ringing thrice a day, calls upon the faithful to detach their minds from worldly affairs, to elevate them from the cares of business to God, to recite and represent to themselves the mystery of the Incarnation, and to realize in the midst of the turmoil of business that they are travelling towards the next world! Has Protestantism anything analogous to show?

We would not willingly cast an imputation on any act of philanthropy, still less on any institution having for its object the amelioration of the condition of the outcast or the wretched. Acts of the kind referred to are not overabundant, and the world has not yet enough of such institutions even to relieve a tithe of the misery that exists! Yet we put it to the thoughtful (and for these especially we write), whether any special charity can be found outside the Church which does not bring upon the recipient an undefined, yet not undefinable, degradation! Is it, perchance, the almshouse, the widows' home, the asylum for the aged, or the charity hospital among Protestants? Ah! my friends, we know something of such places. Circumstances have made it our duty to know a great deal about them, and we have never returned from a visit to one of them without a sensation of horror, not so much occasioned by the wretchedness we there witnessed, as by the supercilious air of superiority with which the wretched beings compelled to be their inmates, were treated. Make it only manifest to us that there is one such institution in this broad land of ours where the sad recipients of charity are not treated more like criminals on Blackwell's Island (or wherever else it may be worse), than like fellow-beings in misfortune, and we shall be not only pleased in the interests of humanity, but stand ready to make the *amende honorable*. Have they free access to spiritual consolation, such as they desire? Are they not very frequently obliged to attend ministrations at which their inmost heart recoils? Are they not frequently made the sufferers of horrors the most atrocious, and which are carefully suppressed from the public, unless when the ever-officious and ubiquitous reporter manages to get an inkling of the facts, and thereby secure an article? Do they, in any way, compare with the gentle sway exercised by the Sisters or Brothers in institutions of the same nature, under Catholic auspices? We have proofs by the score that they do not, and our adversaries well know the facts to be as stated; but, best of all, are the poor inmates themselves aware of it, as is often and often manifested by their eagerness to obtain transfer or admission to the latter. Look at the manner in which the Church (when her poverty permits it), takes care of and tends the poor, the aged, the orphan, the outcast, the sick, the fallen, having special Orders of men and of women instituted and trained for the purpose, whose lives are given to these perennial charities; charities which last century after century; which outlast dynasties, survive governments, and show that they were instituted and are tended by those fully imbued with faith in the words of Christ, when He said, "The poor ye have always with you." Compared with these the other philanthropic works are like the gourd of Jonah: "They spring up in a night and they wither in a night." The spirit of the Master,



the great fountain of true charity, marks the former, while the latter are indelibly and unmistakably stamped with the soup-house style of benefaction and that of Mr. Bumble's *parochial relief*. It will not be forgotten, meanwhile, that a number of these institutions, nominally and professedly established for the benefit of the destitute, were conclusively shown up, some time since, in the papers of our metropolitan city as mere shams, by means of which, under philanthropic pretexts, a few swindlers fleeced the community by wholesale. Does any one ask an indorsement of our charitable institutions; let him ask the inmates of any of them, from the Small-pox Hospital to the House of the Good Shepherd; let him examine them all, from the Foundling Nursery to the Lazar-house and Insane Asylum. There are in them, gentlemen, no set times, when everything is arranged in apple-pie order for the inspection of a Board of Visitors; no brag inmates to be exhibited and praised; none of the reverse description, to be hustled out of the way, snubbed, and maltreated.

If, as is said, imitation be the sincerest kind of flattery, we have the best of reason to congratulate ourselves on the very open admissions in our favor, made by our opponents, who have, in sundry instances, attempted the rather up-hill task of establishing Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, who should perform the same work with our Religious Orders. Many advantages were publicly and openly stated as certain to result from such establishments; but most especial stress was laid upon the benefits resultant to the institutions of which these *quasi* Religions should have charge, as regarded morality and decency. Many attempts have been made in England, especially among Ritualists, and while the cases of entire failure have been many, the effort has, in the long run, not been entirely barren of good results; not, however, in the mode intended, or by securing the establishment of a single permanent Order, but by the fact that the attempt, or rather, the necessity which called for the effort, and the utter impossibility of its success under any other ægis than that of the Church of God, called the attention of the community to the work done by our noble Orders, and to the wants of those to whom it is their duty and delight to minister. In Prussia there is an Order of so-called "*Deaconesses*," which while it confessedly falls far short of the effectiveness of our Sisters of Charity, nevertheless supplied during the late war with France quite a number of hospital nurses, much superior to any that would have been attainable outside the Orders of the Church. Just in so far, however, as they have succeeded, they owe their success to the principles of the Church, and whenever they depart from these failure is the lamentable and inevitable consequence. Where do we find anything comparable with the heroic deeds of the Sisters

of Charity in hospitals, pest houses, asylums of all sorts, and on fields of battle? Have the testimony and admissions of the highest command during our own late war ceased to be remembered? The soldiers of both armies, at least, who were tended and cared for by them, and who have survived their wounds, are not likely to forget their courage, their endurance, their patience, or their self-sacrifice.

Where, again, do we find the most accomplished teachers of youth but among the Religious Orders of the Church, and what more pregnant admission of their value and capacity can those opposed to us in religion make than by sending, as they often do, their sons to the Brothers of the Christian schools, and their daughters to one or other of the institutions under the charge of the female teaching Orders? How sublime are they not, in comparison with the constantly extinguished, because constantly married out, attempts at Religious Congregations among our dissenting friends! All Christendom knows, appreciates, and applauds the Sisters of Charity. Of the teaching Orders, male and female, it is well known by those who have come in contact with them, that in them an education suited to the highest capacity is imparted to their charges by men and women of the highest capacity, with whom teaching is a labor of love, and who are not, as is too frequently the case elsewhere, dependent upon the school as a mode of eking out a precarious livelihood.

The importance that the Catholic attaches to the presence of a clergyman at the hour of death is fairly, though quaintly, expressed in the popular phrase, that a man "*had the benefit of the clergy*," which is tantamount to saying that a priest was present when the decisive hour arrived. Of the nature and importance of the service of the Priest at that supreme moment Catholics do not need to be informed; and Protestants, sticklers though they profess themselves for Scripture, who so quietly, but persistently, ignore the warrant in St. James for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, are hardly likely, without large increase of grace, to understand. True it is that if the priest stood in the same relation to the dying Catholic, and had no more power of assisting him than has the parson or minister towards his moribund parishioner, there would be no necessity for the priest. Any one may recite or read prayers with and for the dying, but we know of no instance up to date in which a preacher has attempted to administer Extreme Unction. Yet the warrant and authority for those who are really in possession of Holy Orders to do so is perfectly clear, and it is a portion of Scripture with which our adversaries know least of all other texts what to do. Other texts they wrest, twist, refine upon, and explain away, but this they can it seems do nothing with, save simply ignore its existence. Here are the words: "Is any man sick among you?"

Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." (*St. James* v. : 14.) Does language mean anything or does it not? Can a Scriptural warrant be clearer; a command of inspiration more distinct and emphatic? How utterly out of place would not preaching be to a man in his agony; and how vain and useless must not their causeless and needless insistence on being present seem to the preachers themselves! Doubtless, it is a delusion desirable to be kept up; though on what argument of utility or advantage to the departing soul, we are utterly at a loss to imagine. Whereas, the priest of the Catholic Church proves daily, in obedience to this command, his apostolic mission; and neither pestilence, field of carnage, bodily peril of any kind, nor effeminate dread of bringing home contagion and plague to "the bosom of a lovely spouse and darling children," hinder God's priests from the performance of their heroic duty in the hospital, the plague ships, the stricken city, or the tatted field. Who that has read accounts of cholera or pestilence but knows of this cheerful performance of duty by priests in all ages? The experience of last year in the diocese of Bishop Elder, and in the whole district afflicted, proves what priests and sisters do in the work of charity. Who is there that remembers the yellow fever of Norfolk in our own land in 1854 but remembers, together with the steadfastness of the humble priest at that place, the prudence, the discretion (we were almost tempted to say the politeness!) of the ministers? But they were right in their own way. They knew they were of no avail to the dying, just as they must acknowledge in their inmost heart that they are not of as much advantage to the living as would be any good book of sermons of their own theological school. Why, then, blame them? We do not blame them *for running away from the danger*; but for *trying to keep up the pretence of their utility* till the danger came, and now again after it is past. No more learned, no more reputable, no more straightforward antagonist has the Church ever had than Leibnitz. We give his words on the value and authority for this purely Catholic practice:

"The anointing of the sick is supported by the words of holy Scripture and the interpretation of the Church—a safe guide for Catholics. I do not see what objection can be made to the holy custom. Of old it was attended by miraculous cures. This miraculous gift, as well as the other extraordinary graces, have become less frequent since the firm establishment of the Church; but we are not to suppose that, even in olden times, all the sick who received extreme unction were cured. What remains at this day, what will always remain, and never deceive us, is the virtue of curing souls that are suitably disposed; a virtue which, according to St. James, gives the remission of sins, as well as increase of faith and courage. Never have we more need of help



than at that hour, when life is in danger; when, amid all the terrors of death, it is necessary to repel the fiery darts of Satan, then more violent than ever."—(*Syst. Theol.*)

A silent but none the less sincere tribute to the Church is offered in the use of her prayers in the service of the only Protestant sect possessing a regular liturgy, for the formation of which our Missal and Breviary would seem to have been culled and translated; and some of the sectaries have not been above translating and adopting (first having divested them of everything distinctively Catholic) several purely Catholic books of devotion, more especially Thomas A'Kempis's *Imitation of Christ* and the *Meditations of S. Bonaventure*. All history testifies to the zeal, purity, disinterestedness, and laboriousness of our missionaries, and in a special manner Bancroft (our own historian), to these qualities as exhibited by the Jesuit missionaries of North America. Indeed, the effectual mission work of the world has been done by Catholics; with the rest, it has been, for the most part, but a sham or a trading venture; and sometimes, as in the case of the Sandwich Islands, a highly successful speculation. All poetry pays its tribute to the customs and practices of Catholicity, in the frequent allusions to "the passing bell," "the vesper bell," "the nuns' sweet hymns," "the cowed monk," "the shriven penitent;" and just as without the Church the literature of antiquity would have been irrecoverably lost, so but for her, architecture, sculpture, painting, and music would hardly exist, and life would be as grim, as angular, and as cheerless as a Protestant meeting-house. Yet strange to say, those who can calm down their dislike and even hatred for each other under no other circumstances, are able to repress temporarily their bitterness, and strike hands for the nonce, that they may deal an insidious stab at the spouse of Christ; and yet not strange to say; since this same state of affairs has long since and frequently been foretold in Scripture.

We close this article, by calling attention to the fact, that not a few bold moves have been made to stir up the fires of religious strife in this country, and although we have full confidence in the sound common sense of the American people (ourselves born and bred here, and proud of it), we would yet fain hope that unscrupulous and scheming demagogues may not even for a time rule the soberer reason of men, who, if so ruled, will hereafter be as much ashamed of themselves, as were the Know-Nothings after their defeat.

When Washington was unanimously elected the first President of the Republic, a congratulatory address was made to him by the Catholics of the country, in which they state:

"This prospect of material prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us on another account,

because, while our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well-founded title to claim, from her justice, equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood spilt under your eyes, and of our common exertions for our defence, under your auspicious guidance; rights rendered more dear to us by the remembrance of former hardships."

The Illustrious President made answer :

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government; or the important assistance they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."—(SPARKS'S *Washington*, vol. xii.)

It is needless for us to assert that :

"We ask for no exclusive privileges whatever; we claim only our clear and undoubted rights in common with our fellow-citizens."—(ABP. SPALDING, *Del. ap. Pastoral*.)

## THE FALL AND RISE OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

*Acta et Decreta Synodi Plenariæ Episcoporum Hiberniæ habitæ apud Maynutiam.* Anon., MDCCCLXXV. Dublin, Typis Browne et Nolan.

*The Irish Race.* By Rev. Aug. I. Thebaud, S. J. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1873.

*Ireland under English Rule.* By the Rev. Father Perraud. Dublin, James Duffy, 1864.

*Life of Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle.* By William I. Fitzpatrick, 2 vols. Donahoe, Boston, 1862.

HOMER says that the day man becomes a slave he loses half his worth. The horizon of his aspirations must be very narrow, if not quite wiped out. *Nolens volens* he lives and moves and almost has his being for the profit of another. So it is with a country. When it has not or loses autonomy, though it may not be merged in the superior country, yet among the nations it is as if it existed not. Ireland is an instance in point. The bounties of nature have been lavished on her with a liberal hand; but they either lie dormant or are subsidized to the aggrandizement of the

ruling country. It is not claimed that she has resources to enable her to rival England in agriculture, manufactures, or commerce; but Sir Robert Kane, an accepted authority, proves, that she has means within herself of sustaining comfortably a population of about nineteen millions. Ireland could at least more than rival Belgium. But having written in some detail on these matters in the January number, and mindful of the adage of the *repetite crambes*, we must pass on to the subject of this paper.

There was a time not many "yesterdays" ago, when educated men scrupled not to assert that the Catholic Church fostered "ignorance, and was opposed to light;" but this charge has been relegated to the *pagani*—the country press, and pulpit. The charge needs no lengthy refutation here; however, we will quote the testimony of two great names: St. Augustine exclaims of the Church, "*Tu pueriliter pueros, fortiter juvenes, quiete senes, prout cujusque non corporis tantum sed et animi ætas est, exerceas et doces.*"<sup>1</sup> (Moribus Eccl., lib. i., cap. 30.) Evidently he feared not the boldest ranges of speculation when guided by the proper authority. He is the acknowledged Father of Christian philosophy. Bossuet, a kindred genius and almost his disciple in later times, draws with a master hand his estimate of the importance of human knowledge. As the passage is rather long we must condense his language though we thereby mar its splendor.

"I am not one of those who undervalue human learning. I confess I cannot contemplate the discoveries of science and arts without astonishment. Man has almost changed the face of the earth. He has tamed the fiercest animals and disciplined their strength. He has made the antagonistic elements of fire and water minister to his wants. Nay, more—he has mounted to the heavens and made the stars to mark a safe path on his journeys over the sea, and forced even the sun to keep count of the hours for the regulation of his daily life. He ranges through the extent of nature, and there is no part of the universe that does not bear traces of his industry."

If, therefore, in times past or even now, the state of education is not what we could wish in Ireland, the Church is not to blame; and before we conclude this paper we hope to be able to prove at whose door the blame justly lays. She has been made and kept poor and held up to scorn. "*Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se quam quod ridiculos homines facit*" (Juvenal, sec. 3, 152) is an experience she has endured too long.

There were three earthly things Augustine desired to see but

<sup>1</sup> Thou teachest and trainest children in childlike fashion, youth more solidly, the old with gentleness, as their age and mental growth require.



did not,—Rome in its glory, Tully declaiming, and Paul preaching. Britain claims that she enjoyed all three; but Ireland makes no such claim. St. Paul never announced the glad tidings of salvation to her sons; and no broken arches or crumbling ruins of fallen temples remain to show that Roman power ever extended to her shores. The pages of Thucydides and Livy may have been unknown to her scholars, yet it is proved that from a very early period she had letters of her own; and when the great Apostle St. Patrick came, he found a people partially prepared to embrace the Gospel when it was properly demonstrated to them. Soon after her conversion she became a great nursery of learning and religion.

Those even moderately acquainted with history know that towards the latter part of the fourth century, the old order of civilization was breaking up, and that a long period of strife ensued before the new order was established. France, Italy, Spain—all Western Europe was convulsed to the depths. Writers have used several figures to express the condition of society during this crisis. They call it a second deluge; and the Church, like the ark, floating over the troubled waters preserved for the benefit of after ages, the deposit of faith and learning intrusted to her care. But these social convulsions did not affect Ireland. Separated from the continent, her insular position preserved her from the northern hordes. "About the middle of the fifth century," says Görres, "St. Patrick established religion in the Emerald Isle. The manners of her people were soon refined; great numbers of schools were erected, and science and piety flourished. While Europe was torn by wars, Ireland reposed in safety. It seemed as if cloisters and hermits were transferred from the Nile; and during three centuries Ireland produced eight hundred saints, and converted to Christianity the North of England and a great part of Germany that was then pagan." (Mystik.) In those days Ireland was often called "New Rome," or the "Holy Isle," and persons flocked there from France and England to receive an education. Monasteries dotted the slopes and valleys, and wherever there was a monastery there was sure to be a school. Often these monasteries were erected into Episcopal sees; their names are still preserved in the Irish hierarchy. Clonfert, Emly, Ossory testify to this, though the schools that gave them origin have almost passed from the memory of man.

But those days and abodes of peace were now to be disturbed; her insular position could no longer protect her. The Danes came, and Ireland to this day bears marks of their visit. The people were slaughtered; churches and schools were burned, and learning almost extinguished. The great school of Armagh with its

seven thousand scholars was scattered, and so in other places. We cannot here recount their evil deeds; but we know education suffered by their presence. The plain of Clontarf decided their destiny; and they were driven back to Scandanavia, or those who remained soon amalgamated with the people.

A century later the Normans made their appearance in Ireland. One of them tells us they found themselves as if in a new world; so unlike was Ireland to the countries of Europe. Though the Danes wrought much destruction, yet the laws and customs of the country remained intact. The Normans professed the Catholic faith and avowed that they came to encourage religion and restore discipline. But it soon was manifest that they aimed at conquest and the extermination of the natives. Learning under such circumstances could make no great advancement. The science most necessary was how to defend their homes, and not to transcribe parchments or found colleges. Father Thebâud<sup>1</sup> remarks that the arrival of the Normans was at the commencement of a transition era—that of the Crusades. It will always be a mooted question whether they resulted in more evil than good; but there can be no doubt much evil was the consequence. Millions left home to fight for the Cross and rescue their brethren from the thralldom of the Mohammedan. They went more as a mob than an army, and knowing little of the dangers they had to encounter. Very many of them returned to Europe not fervent Christians, but deeply tainted with the old heresies of the East. Under the guise of perpetuating their military organization, they laid the foundation of those secret societies—as the very names of some betray—that now are the affliction of modern society. The old traditions of the Gnostics and Manichees were introduced into Europe, and the ablest theologians, such as St. Thomas, were forced to discuss the very foundation principles of religion, theology. Ireland did not belong to the European family, and took no part in these Crusades. She, therefore, escaped the contagion of the ancient heresies. Had she had control of her own destinies at this period when the great universities on the continent were founded, who can estimate the benefits she might have conferred on religion and learning? But instead of laying the foundations of universities and being a light and guide to Europe, she was engaged during all this time in combat with her troublesome neighbors of the Pale. Within the Pale an effort was made to establish a university, once in Dublin and at another time in Drogheda, but the Irish either would not, or could not frequent them, and they failed. Two social systems were struggling for the mastery, the feudal and the Brehon system, and the result is known.

---

<sup>1</sup> Irish Race.

Spenser and the early English writers are very severe on the *Brehon* laws and customs. They either did not understand or wilfully misrepresented them. Part of the *Brehon* code has of late years been translated and published, and is, therefore, submitted to the criticism of competent judges. *Campion*, an Englishman, and afterwards a Jesuit martyr, has left a description of a school of *Brehon* law as he saw it in 1571. "They (the rising *Brehons*) speak Latin like a vulgar tongue;" and he saw "several of them stretched at full length conning their tasks, and learning by rote fragments of the Roman and Irish law—the Civil Institutes and *Brehon* law, at which they continued for many years." Those who spent sometimes sixteen years and more in the study of these codes could not afterwards be barbarous judges. Of the civil law Chancellor Kent writes: "The whole body of the civil law excites never-failing curiosity, and receives the homage of scholars as a singular monument of human wisdom;" and he quotes Sir Matthew Hale as declaring, that "a man could never understand law as a science without first resorting to the Roman law for information."<sup>1</sup> This the Irish law students did; and we are justified, therefore, in concluding that the *Brehon* code was no barbarous jargon, and that the *Brehons* were, or should be, intelligent judges.

From the foregoing outline we can learn why no great university was established in Ireland up to the dawn of the Reformation, though education was by no means neglected. Before that, from Henry the Second's time, the contest was between Norman and Irish—between the feudal and the *Brehon* system; henceforth the tenor not only of the education but of the whole Irish question was forced into a new direction. The Irish question merged into the struggle between Protestantism and Catholicity.

When the Apostles went forth to convert the nations they did not preach up sedition, they appealed to the human reason and conscience; St. Paul did not seek to burn the Parthenon. When St. Patrick came to Ireland he did not commence a war of extermination and a religious plantation. But Protestantism pursued a course of its own. Like *Eolus* unchaining the winds, it let loose the passions. It proclaimed itself the herald of liberty, but despotism followed in its train. It could desolate, but it could not build up the Church of God. After the lapse of three centuries, with all its power and wealth, it has to confess itself unable to convert the Irish. Like Milton's cloud, "its sable side" was turned towards the Irish Catholics, and "its silver lining" was for the Protestants. In plain prose, Protestantism was a weapon to crush Catholic faith and to enrich the small fraction of its adherents.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kent's Commentaries, vol. i., page 507.



As an evangelist, Henry VIII. was not a success even in his own country. Early in his career he called in the aid of the schoolmaster in Ireland. In 1537 an act was passed ordering every parish minister "to keep or cause to be kept a school in his parish, in order to learn himself, and introduce the English tongue." Five years later several religious houses were suppressed, and the property bestowed on favorites on condition "of keeping household and hospitalitie." The seizure of Church property and the enriching of a small party was begun. We learn from Spenser that the Protestant clergy were in a deplorable condition, and excited only contempt. In 1570 another act was passed, providing for the erection of free schools in every diocese and under English masters; the end in view was to "secure a due obedience from the people to their princes and rulers, whose ignorance of those high points touching their damnation," arose from the youth being brought up in no school, public or private. To crown the work of Protestant education, Queen Elizabeth, in 1591, founded Trinity College, with the privileges of a university, on the site of the Augustinian Monastery of All Hallows, now called College Green, but at that time on the outskirts of Dublin. The new State Church had obtained control of education both parochial and university. Vast sums were expended, but education did not flourish. The Irish rejected the Reformation, and the parish or diocesan schools had few or no pupils except the children of the teacher and minister. Wealthy Protestants who were English sent their sons to be educated in England. During this reign the Catholics managed to keep up schools of their own. Archdeacon Lynch, who wrote under Queen Elizabeth, states that there were in Ireland thirty-one Cathedral (Catholic) schools, and the Religious Orders had several more. The Jesuits had twelve colleges. King James made it a condition of the Plantation of Ulster that schools should be erected, and set apart 100,000 acres for that purpose. This was the origin of the royal schools of Armagh, Dungannon, Raphoe, and four others. Trinity College received a large *bonus* of lands. These schools were not well attended. In 1633 we find the Lord Deputy complaining that "these schools were ill governed, that the lands were either dissipated or concealed, and the money applied underhand to the maintenance of Popish schoolmasters." It was complained that even the Plantation Catholic schools were so large "that they were universities rather than schools." The Jesuits, early in the reign of Charles I., founded a university, "a fair college building," in Dublin.

It would seem impossible for Catholics to keep schools, not to say a university, when the whole spirit of the government was against them. Many circumstances conspired in their favor.

Though good public highways were laid out from an early period, as we learn from the (*Leabhar na g-Ccart*), Book of Rights, they were not as numerous as they are now. The country was almost covered with woods, and towns were few. The army was stationed in quarters far apart, and the natives, owing to this, could escape molestation. Besides, the laws, though bad enough, had not acquired "the vicious perfection" they did in after times. Moreover, penal laws against conscience and religion generally defeat themselves; man is naturally unwilling to persecute his neighbor unless he has some great interest to maintain. Protestants in the midst of a large Catholic population desired to be in peace, when not molested themselves. Catholic institutions were therefore connived at or tolerated, but on every outburst of puritanical prejudice they were closed or destroyed. The Catholic University of Back Lane, Dublin, was seized and handed over to Trinity College. The very year in which this occurred a most important work in Irish literature was undertaken in the mountains of Donegal—the *Annals of the Four Masters*. Two friars, the brothers O'Cleary, assisted by two others wrote this great history in four years. Manuscripts and records were fast disappearing, and they sent agents into every part of the country to collect materials. It was a timely undertaking, for in a few years the whole land was torn by civil strife, which led to the formation of the Confederation of Kilkenny.

Three hundred years before, in this good city of Kilkenny, King John's Parliament proclaimed utter war on the "mere" Irish; now another Parliament proclaimed reconciliation—a Union. *Pro Deo, Rege et Patria, Hiberni Unanimes*, was the motto of the great seal of the Confederation. Delegates were elected from every county and borough town. An executive, called the Supreme Council, was appointed to discharge all the functions of a duly regulated government. Protestants were admitted by pledging themselves to uphold the cause of the Confederates. It was a National Parliament, perhaps the only really national one that has ever assembled in Ireland since the Norman invasion. All hearts beat high with hope of righting their native land; but these hopes were soon to end in utter disappointment. In the first article of the Remonstrance presented to the King's Commissioners, in 1642, the Confederate Catholics complain that they were "debarred from learning in universities and public schools." The bishops engaged to establish colleges in various places, and the Supreme Council proposed to found a university. The Pope sent over a Nuncio with large supplies of money and arms, and France and Spain were represented by agents. But in a short time old jealousies were renewed, and the Confederation ended in disaster, and the country lay at the mercy of the Protector. It does not fall

within our purpose to give details of this eventful period. In the course of a very few years five-sixths of the people had perished, and of those who survived, over 60,000 were shipped to the Barbadoes and the tobacco districts of America. Not one of these was alive in twenty years. How fared it with the Catholics? The long Parliament declared that popery or idolatry could not be tolerated, and priests were ordered under pain of death to depart the country. It is recorded of a friar that he chose, in the middle of a vast bog, a spot harder than the rest, and built a hut on it as a school. Large numbers of youths erected little huts around, to study the elements of learning, and bore with joy the inconveniences of their position. Only one aged bishop existed in the land. And yet Milton at this time was publishing his high-sounding *Areopagitica*, which modern liberals admire as the handbook of free press and free speech.

After the Restoration the Irish founded colleges in several parts of France, out of the wreck of their fortunes, and by aid from friends; and the laws not being rigidly enforced they opened schools at home. Sir William Petty writes of the Irish peasantry, in 1672, that "French and Latin were not unknown to many of them. The latter, amongst the poorest Irish, and chiefly in Kerry, where it is very freely spoken." The Marquis of Lansdowne, a direct descendant of Sir William, owns great tracts of lands in Kerry, and we doubt if his tenants are now so well acquainted with French and Latin, as when his ancestor came into possession two hundred years ago. At this time *Erastus Smith*, one of Cromwell's troopers, left the rents of 12,958 acres of land to establish three free schools in Galway, Drogheda, and Tipperary. His schoolmasters were bound publicly to pray and read the Scriptures. He found it easier to rob the Irish of their lands than of their faith: "My Lords," he writes to the governors, "my designe is not to reflect upon any, only I give my judgement why those schools are so consumptive, which was, and is, and will be (if not prevented), the many popish schools their neighbors, which as suckers do starve the tree. If parents will exclude their children because prayers, catechism, and exposition are commanded, I cannot help it, for to remove that barre is to make them seminaries of Popery." The Catholic spirit must have great recuperative powers to enable the Catholics of Ireland to outrival Protestant schools endowed with their property.

During three-quarters of a century after the expulsion of King James, the ingenuity of Parliament was taxed to devise additional plans for the destruction of what they styled Popery. The result is enshrined for all time in the penal code. Hitherto the schoolmaster could wield his rod unnoticed, unless, like the *miles gloriosus*, he made himself too ostentatious. But now he was put in



the same category with the wolf and the friar. It was made an offence to be punished by death for any one to teach a school either public or private. Yet like the friar, the schoolmaster was "abroad," and survived the ordeal. He originated what were known as the "hedge schools." Pure air and free ventilation; easy means of ingress and egress; a just amount of gymnastic exercise to relieve studies—these are the *desiderata* that have puzzled modern philanthropists and educators. The versatile talents of the Irish schoolmaster were equal to these difficulties. Plato discoursed philosophy *inter Sylvas Academi*, and why could not he do the same? In some remote corner beneath a hedge and spreading tree he gathered his pupils, and they were not "cabined, cribbed, confined," as were those who studied under the *ollamhs* of yore. Ventilation was pure; fires were not thought of; and health was promoted by regular exercise, as his scholars, in turns, had to ascend and descend the tallest branches of trees to snuff the danger from afar, and give the alarm when the spy was on the trail. Others, as we have seen, retired to the bogs and erected huts with turf, and doubtless as they gazed on the

*"Pauperis et tuguri congestum cespite culmens,"*

they felt themselves as learned Fellows as any beneath the shadow of the "Silent Sister" of Trinity College. Bishop England, in one of his letters on the Roman Chancery, gives a vivid picture of these events witnessed by his father. Dr. Doyle, in a moment of splendid musing, writes, how "the haunts of these men in times of persecution are still pointed out by the aged inhabitants with a sort of pride mingled with piety; and they say, there a bishop administered confirmation; we remember how he lived in yonder old walls, in common with the young priests whom he prepared for the mission. Oh! if you saw him, he was like St. Patrick himself." The Catholics were, step by step, deprived of every right, civil, social, and natural. Dr. Curry, in his *Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland*, tells us that in 1745 the very existence of Catholics was ignored by the law, they had no right which the law should respect, though they were three-fourths of the population. It is plain that were such laws strictly enforced during over half a century, scarcely a Catholic could be found in the land. But they were not, as they were aimed at property more than religion. Arthur Young, a learned Englishman, who wrote an account of his travels through Ireland in 1776 says: "I have conversed on the subject with some of the most distinguished characters in the kingdom, and I cannot after all but declare that the scope, purport, and aim of the laws of discovery as executed, are not against the Catholic religion, which increases under them, but against the industry and property of

whoever professes that religion." Even so, it surprises how the people survived the ordeal. Philosophers ascribe it to ethnological causes, or the laws of craniology. Father Thebaud<sup>1</sup> gives a more satisfactory solution.

The Irish, he remarks, well understood the difference between the temporal and the eternal, and when a choice had to be made, they chose the latter in preference to the former. Their faith inspired them with a spirit of longanimity, with courage and with hope; like Abraham, they hailed their redemption in the distance. In the words of another, "Our books, our masters, and our schools were such, no doubt, as became a people once rich and learned, but again reduced to want and barbarism; withal they were sufficient to guard the sacred fire, now turned into thick water, until better times would return, when, like that found by the prophet, it would be *received once more and borne in triumph to the temple.*"

Under these circumstances, ecclesiastical colleges could not exist in Ireland; but out of the wreck of their property, and by the generosity of friends, the Irish founded several on the Continent. These supplied priests for the dangerous mission in their native land. The position of those priests was an anomalous one. They were not always persecuted, but the law, like the sword of Damocles, was constantly over their heads. Men, trained in all the refinement of French manners, and whose minds were stored with theology, philosophy and eloquence, returned to minister to a rude people, not in churches of mediæval splendor, but "wandering over mountains, in deserts and caves." We could give the names of many, but one must suffice, the Rev. Father O'Leary. He was educated in France, and soon after his return took his rank in wit as the peer of Swift, and his superior in Christian grace. His society was sought by the first men of the land, and Senators honored him with their eulogiums. "Did I not know him to be a Christian clergyman, by his works I should suppose him to be a philosopher of the Augustan age." But this is somewhat in anticipation.

Thus Catholic education, as far as law could effect it, was eliminated. The maxim of Lord Bacon was verified: knowledge—that is, Protestant knowledge, if there was such a thing—was power. Every one, from the coal porter to the viceroy felt it. There were twenty-seven, if not more, endowed schools; these yearly sent a large number of students to the University of Trinity College. To its graduates was open the path to fame and wealth and power. The Catholics were looked down upon as slaves, and as such they had lost, not "half their worth," but almost the whole of it, for they

<sup>1</sup> In his work on the Irish Race.

could not be sold in the market. "Where this is the case in any part of the world," says Edmund Burke, "those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege." Those men were proud and jealous of their privileges; very many of them had refined social virtues and generous impulses, and some were men of rare eloquence. But the Catholics generally listened to their dithyrambs as the helots, in Athens, listened to Demosthenes discoursing *on the Crown*. Those men aimed to perpetuate a caste, and not to create a nation. To descend from their pride of place and ascendancy, and be fellow-citizens with their fellow-countrymen, the Irish Catholics, scarcely entered their minds. And when the alternative was forced on them, many of them preferred to sell the independence of their country, than share it in equality with the Catholics, as Ormond, a century and a half before, betrayed Ireland, rather than see the confederate Catholics enjoy religious liberty. Even Grattan, with all his declamation about Ireland and independence, affected towards the Catholics a consciousness of superiority.

The last part of the last century was pregnant with great events. It produced the American, and about twenty years later, the French Revolution. Then originated what is now known by the words "instalments of justice." The instalments of wrong were persistent and logical; but the instalments of justice, if meant as such, followed no fixed law; and if meant as mercy, they were "strained." They have thus far obeyed the dictates of that imperial mistress, *necessity*, of which the English statesmen seem to be such clever adepts. Under the pressure of the times, the Catholics had restored to them many rights. Nay, in the very exuberance of liberality, the English government not only conceded religious toleration, but established and endowed the College of Maynooth. Some even proposed to endow a great Catholic University, though they are still hesitating on the subject in this last quarter of the nineteenth century. Mr. Pitt and his friends did not admire the principles of the French revolutionists; and as the Irish must have pastors, they concluded it was safer to enable them to study at home. We have before us proofs to sustain these statements, but do not suppose it necessary to quote them.

In 1733, besides the existing schools, the government established what were known as the *Charter Schools*, for the express purpose of educating the children of Catholics in the Protestant religion. It is estimated that about a million dollars a year were spent on these schools. They were *Souper* schools on a respectable scale, and they failed. They were followed by the Kildare schools.



The Kildare schools at first had the sanction of prominent Catholics, as it was promised they would be impartial. But, "do men gather figs from thorns?" They had poison on their wings, as was soon discovered. There arose then a man who marks an era in the history of modern education in Ireland,—the illustrious I. K. L., James Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. Discarding the tone of servility engendered by the penal laws, he appealed to justice and the spirit of the British Constitution. He insisted that the Catholics were subjects, and should be put on a par with any other portion of the people; they could not and should not be content with anything less. He crippled the iniquitous system of the tithes. He dealt a blow at the Established Church, and announced its downfall; and he upset the Kildare schools. The Irish, he urged, were naturally intellectual and fond of learning; but the fountains of education were designedly corrupted, and they could not partake of it. We enrich our pages with one lofty passage from his writings on the subject:

"But let not the group confound us; let us take a single captive and view him in his prison of the soul, incapable, almost, of counting by notches the days of his captivity. Let us view him, seated amidst one of his ancient cities, on the side of some decayed temple, amazed at the lofty grandeur of its mouldering arches, but ignorant, perhaps, that the very soil existed a century before. But let him only be made acquainted with the history of his country, let her heroes, her saints, and her sages pass in review before his enraptured imagination—let the chiding spirit of one of her orators point out to him the wreck of his country, and the gloomy melancholy will confer more real pleasure than the sceptre of a monarch could bestow; but the effect will not stop here. He will be aroused from his lethargy; he will vindicate his own rights and that of his country, or enrich her with the product of his labor or his art."

Of Bishop Doyle, Cardinal Wiseman expressed himself as follows, on his visit to Carlow, in 1858:

"He remembered, when young himself, reading the glowing letters which awakened anew an enthusiastic feeling in every one who perused them, which, while they confounded the enemies of the faith, encouraged its friends, and which might be said to be the first trumpet-note of that outspoken Catholicity, and bold avowal of faith, which had since become the general law of the country. He remembered the enemies of their faith perplexed—struck by wonder at the man whose courage and ability, and address and learning and eloquence, enabled him to speak so powerfully in defence and vindication of his religion."

The Kildare schools vanished and were succeeded by the

*National School* system, which, with various modifications, has continued to exist down to the present.

This system of primary education originated with Lord Stanley in 1831. It was intended to be truly *national*, and not to be used injudiciously for the purpose of a proselytism. To secure the confidence of all parties, Catholic as well as Protestant, stringent rules were drawn up for the management of these schools. Lord Stanley stated "that for the success of the undertaking much must depend on the character of the individuals who compose the board of education." The government pledged itself that all religious opinions should be fairly represented in the board. But this engagement was not kept. In 1845 the board received a charter of incorporation, and it was stipulated that the members should never be less than four, nor more than fifteen. The following are the proportions in which Catholics appear on the board from its formation. The first commissioners were seven; of these five were Protestants and two Catholics. Between 1838 and 1853, of the seventeen members appointed to fill up vacancies, eleven were Protestants and six Catholics. From 1853 to 1860 the board attained its maximum of fifteen members, and nine were Protestants and six were Catholics. Now the Catholics were more than three-fourths of the population, and instead of being in the minority should have had a majority in the board. The consequence was, that when delicate questions regarding religious instruction were referred to this board, the majority invariably inclined towards the State religion. We have before us well-authenticated facts to prove this. Books, as much, if not more than teachers, tell the spirit of the school. Two series of class-books were prepared, one for religious and the second for profane subjects. They were fourteen in number; thirteen of them were compiled by Englishmen, and only one by an Irishman, a Dr. Sullivan, an Ulster Protestant. The Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Whately, a member of the board, drew up a book of Scripture Lessons. He pledged himself to the sincerest impartiality; how well he kept his pledge we may learn from the following extract found in his *Life*, written by his daughter. He said: "The education supplied by the National Board is gradually supplanting the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. I believe that mixed education is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me." This was impartiality with a vengeance! How was Irish history taught? in three lines. This

was not all. The editors taught the pupils to thank God for having made them happy *English* children. Here is a morsel of a hymn that used to be sung in school :

“I thank the goodness and the grace  
That on my birth have smiled,  
And made me in these Christian days  
A happy *English* child!”

The following is the number of pupils attending the National Schools, December 31st, 1876, and the religious denominations :

PROVINCE.	RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION.				Total.
	Roman Catholic.	P. E. Church.	Presbyterian.	Other persuasions.	
Leinster, . .	199,287	9,375	1,164	444	
Munster, . .	268,068	7,227	506	605	
Connaught, .	170,938	4,894	633	287	
Ulster, . . .	181,072	71,163	109,165	7,387	
					1,032,215

In the mixed schools where the teachers are Protestant the percentage of pupils is more than 50 per cent. Protestant, and in Ulster the percentage is 107 per cent.

Now, if precautions against proselytism had to be made we would expect that in the Catholic districts they would be in behalf of the Protestant children, and in Ulster in behalf of the Catholic. Let us see. The old rule was that children should be obliged not to remain, if of a different creed from the religious instructor. This rule was twisted so as to mean that the teacher could not oblige them to remain. A very wide difference. In the first case the teacher was obliged to remove the pupils when of a different creed; in the second case he was not; the children might remain without the consent of parents or pastor. The schools were managed strictly according to the old rule in the Catholic districts; but in Ulster, the Protestant *pale*, the second rule was enforced. Protestant landlord influence was brought to bear on the schools, and parents were often afraid to oppose it. All this is matter of record. It was not denied; it was openly avowed. Hence the “National System” called forth remonstrance from an early day. It was assailed in the press, Parliament was petitioned, and the bishops laid the matter before Rome. All this in time had its effect. Rome declared in favor of denominational schools, but pronounced no final judgment on the National System. Various modifications have been introduced, so that if all danger be not prevented it is greatly lessened. The board of commissioners are now twenty, one-half of whom are Catholics. Parochial school property is not vested in the board, but in the parochial managers, and we learn from the papers that the Irish language is now taught in them. The



Synod of Maynooth, held in 1875, laid down these statutes, which are to be strictly observed by all pastors: 1. Books containing aught repugnant to faith or morals are to be absolutely rejected. 2. No book treating of faith or morals to be introduced unless first approved by the Ordinary. 3. Bishops and parish priests to provide in each parish a sufficient number of schools. 4. That they, in co-operation with the laity, constantly urge on the government to grant more equitable conditions with regard to these schools. 5. As far as possible that school property be vested in trustees, to wit, the bishop, the parish priest, and one or more persons approved by the bishop. 6. The parish priest in person or by his vicar should visit at least every week the National Schools, attended by the Catholic children of his parish, and see that the teachers properly discharge their duties; and also give religious instruction and make an entry in the register kept for the purpose. To neglect this duty during four successive weeks renders the priest liable to severe censure by the Ordinary. It is furthermore enjoined on pastors not to solicit aid from the board to erect schools without the consent of the bishop, nor to transfer the title of schools already erected to the Commissioners. These precautions were deemed essential to prevent abuse and guard the rights of Catholic parents and children. But the government has the right to inspect these schools.

We have seen that there are a million pupils attending the National Schools, 79 per cent. of whom are Catholics. But we are not to suppose that these are the only Catholic children receiving primary education. In nearly all towns of any importance there are schools for girls conducted by the Sisters, and for boys by the Christian Brothers. It is a well-established fact, that personal devotion and Christian charity can and do what salaried officers never can. Our hospitals and schools prove this. The schools of the Brothers are thronged, the best order and cleanliness prevail, the schoolbooks are equal and in many respects superior to the government ones. They give the elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic; and they are not ashamed to recall the saints and heroes, "the cloud of witnesses," to the pride and glory of Ireland.

It is almost within the memory of men still living when Catholic colleges for intermediate education could be opened. They were generally on an unpretending scale, as the people were just beginning to repair their own fortunes. Yet some, such as Carlow, Thurles, and Kilkenny presented an imposing front. But they could not compete with the endowed Protestant colleges. The author of a book, who signs himself an *Ulsterman*, remarks that in the early stages of their college course the Protestant students outnumber Catholics; but after fifteen years and upwards the Catholics were far in the

majority. How was this? The Protestant had passed to the University, but the Catholic had to continue in his college to receive all the education he was ever to receive, for there was no University for him.

Over thirty years ago the Queen's Colleges were erected, now clothed with the powers of a University. But as they are based on the secular system, neutrality in religion, they were condemned by Rome. Some are surprised at this; but can religion ever be a neutral question? Religion is a science, and has its prime principles from which deductions may be drawn, just as mathematics or any other human science. Religion teaches that man originally was created after the image of God, was surrounded with honor and glory, and little less than the angels. A learned pundit in his chair coolly states to his pupils that he is a little superior to his ancestor, the monkey. Can both these propositions be true? Impossible. For these and other reasons the Church condemns the neutral system. The majority of those who now frequent the Queen's Colleges go there to study some practical course, such as engineering or medicine. Those colleges are practically a failure.

Within the past year Catholic intermediate education has been recognized, and a law passed to put it upon a solid footing. We have not read the act, but hope it is equal to the requirements of a Catholic people. This last "instalment of justice" must lead to another,—the granting of a charter to the Catholic University.

The mere granting of a *charter* cannot, by any means, satisfy the Irish Catholics, as it would only give a legal recognition to its academical diplomas. The people have a right to claim more,—the Catholic University, to fulfil its functions, should be endowed. This can now be accomplished without injustice to any party. What was styled the Church of Ireland was, from the beginning, a *magnum latrocinium*. Its dignitaries were enriched with the spoils of Catholics. Trinity College had over \$200,000 per annum. Its revenues and those of the Protestant Bishops could not be accurately ascertained. They held large estates, and rented them on long lease, on easy terms, taking a consideration in money, imitating the steward in the Gospel, who made friends with the mammon of iniquity. In 1829, after the granting of emancipation, Tom Moore started an Irish gentleman from his chambers, in Trinity College, in search of a religion, by exclaiming "Thank God, I now can become a Protestant." After Gladstone's act of disestablishment, a Protestant may exclaim, "Thank God, I can now become a Catholic." The stigma of his Church is removed. He can now search into her merits. The resources of the Establishment will be ascertained, and after settling all just claims, there will remain ample means to put Catholic educational institutions on a proper basis. No ascen-

dency, but just equality; Irishmen of all creeds will know they have a common country.

We have exhausted the proper limits of our paper, and, we fear, the patience of our readers. We have touched only on the *summa rerum* of education in Ireland. But it was not our aim to write a treatise on education. That must be done by abler pens than ours. In America some do not appreciate the Catholic University. High education is for the benefit of the few; why, then, trouble the poor with annual collections? They forget that the history of the world verifies the words of St. James, "that every good gift comes from above." When the higher and educated classes are unsettled in faith and morals, the lower soon suffer in consequence. We could accumulate proofs. Can mobs and riots regenerate Ireland? Had not O'Connell been a Catholic, what would she be to-day? Is it nothing that Catholic scholars can take care of her interests and reputation? And instead of its being thought that faith was for the uneducated, it is seen and known that it is compatible with and adorns the highest mental culture.

Therefore the Synod of Maynooth exhorts "all Bishops and priests and laity to favor, as far as they may, those who have satisfactorily completed their studies in the Catholic University. In this is our hope that we will effectually repel from our shores, the monsters of Rationalism and Indifference, and at last vindicate, for this Ireland of ours, her hereditary glory of being in name and fact, *the Ireland of Saints and Doctors.*"

---



## STEPS TO ATHEISM.

I READ some time ago in the *Correspondent*, a few articles bearing the title: "What is found in Old Letters?" Now old books also contain something. Lately I have been running through one that was printed first in 1717, and again in 1724. It is this latter edition that fell into my hands. Fortunately for me—however it may be with others—the aforesaid book deals with a subject which is not out of date. It is all upon atheism, or upon those who say that there is no God. Now though we live in an age of unusual light, it is our painful duty to confess that atheism, practical and in a manner doctrinal, is common among even what are called the educated classes. Many scientists openly favor it and teach it, and as unhappily in this instance, their word is law, others who know little or nothing, fall to echoing: "There is no God." It is sad to have to make such an acknowledgment at this stage of the world's existence; but the error itself is sadder still on account of its results. God is the basis of all religion, of morality, government, and society. To eject him is to ruin all that is desirable for man. There is nothing more nonsensical than atheism; it is the surest and worst road to every ruin.

This excessive evil does not culminate at once, for the adage says: *Nemo repente fit summus*. Like other diseases atheism has its stages. The book that I have been reading treats of the *origin*, not of the *nature* of the malady. Indeed, some of our modern great men assign a very grand origin to disbelief in God's existence. It is born, they claim, of intellect; it is especially the child of science and of progress. Higher civilization and culture infallibly beget it. But the author of my book is not quite so flattering. He was a Jesuit named Gengell, and a Pole at that. Who does not know that Jesuits are famed for saying and doing queer things? Fr. Gengell published his work at Brunsberg, and modestly called it *Gradus ad Atheismum*; or, as we would say in English: "Steps to Atheism." We shall draw on this book for the substance of this article. Note the *He* replacing the foregoing *I*. Since Fr. Gengell is about to speak, I must naturally be silent. As we journey on, the steps of more than a hundred years ago may appear very like the steps of to-day.

Fr. Gengell reduces his Steps to three: First, certain kinds of sins; secondly, heresies; thirdly, erroneous opinions. We might condense them into two, namely, errors of the intellect and of the will; but let the author have his way, since there is no great harm in it.

By "Steps to Atheism" is not meant anything inevitably conducing to a denial of God's existence or nature. In accordance with Holy Writ and the saints there is question only of a disposition which, once it possesses a soul, renders the descent to atheism exceedingly easy. And the atheism that we have in view is not moral atheism, namely the atheism of those who though they admit a God, live and act withal as if they believed nothing of the kind. Or as St. Paul writes to Titus (1 v. 16): "They profess that they know God, but in their works they deny him, being abominable, and incredulous, and to every good work reprobate." No, the atheists we are considering are formal and properly so called atheists; that is, men who deny *ore rotundo* that there is a God, or positively doubt his existence. Furthermore, to drop into the abyss of atheism we need not go over all the steps, one alone is quite enough.

Again, in all that we are about to say, we disclaim all intention to hurt any one's feelings. We speak only from a love of truth and with a view to bring back those who have strayed from its path. In the words of Lactantius, we shall deem ourselves to have lived long enough and to have done our duty as men, should our labor free only one soul from the toil of error, and place it on the way to heaven.

Having finished our preliminaries we come to statements of doctrine. Our first assertion is, that to commit and to live habitually in grievous sin is a step toward atheism. Scripture teaches this truth. The Book of Proverbs declares that the wicked man when he is come into the depth of sin, contemneth (Prov. 18, v. 3). That is, as commentators expound the text, he will despise advice and advisers; he will set at naught all laws, human and divine, and condemn the blessed inhabitants of heaven up to God himself. Indeed all mortal sin is at once atheism and pantheism—atheism, because it rejects the true God with his commandments and laws; pantheism, because sin prefers self and other creatures to God, and deifies them as far as it can do so. This is one of the reasons why God's hatred for sin is so great. Writing to Timothy (1 Tim. i, v. 19), St. Paul says that some, rejecting a good conscience, have made shipwreck of their faith. By a good conscience is here meant a sinless life. Neglecting this, says St. John Chrysostom, these people lost their faith and became apostates, schismatics, heretics, and even atheists. A house full of the smoke of sin, says St. Clement of Rome, prevents those who dwell in it from seeing the Maker of all things. Clement of Alexandria asserts that the cause of men's ignorance of God is the bad life they lead.

Who that looks at the world, says St. Hilary, does not see that God exists? And yet it often happens that while truth compels

us to accept God, the allurements of vice induce us to say that there is no God.

The teachings of Scripture and of the saints are naturally enough supported by reason. Wicked men, who are not utterly dead to morality, are stung by sin. They wish to escape the penalty which they feel that God will exact for it. They cannot bear the clamors of conscience, were it only to sin more freely. But the troublesome avenger will not down; it is not so easy to hush God's voice. In his torture the sinner has recourse to doubt. Perhaps there is no God, and soon there is no God. In these matters abysses are subordinated; hence one soon leads to another. One of the most terrific penalties of sin is that this sin prepares the way for that sin, and so on to the end of the deadly list. Besides, frequent repetition of grievous sin amounts to frequent turning away from God. Every day, or oftener, we close our eyes to His divine light, and put away from us the help that He gives us against sin. Justly, therefore, God leaves us to ourselves and withdraws His efficacious grace. Thereupon the sinner constantly falls into worse sins, gives himself up to a reprobate sense, nay, to that worst of all sin, there is no God.

All grievous sin, then, paves the way to atheism. There are, however, certain kinds of sin that more especially foster the horrible vice. Among these is deservedly classed inordinate, intense love of wealth. Such desire imbeds the mind in the gross things of earth, materializes it, and renders it, to say the least, unscrupulous in the use of means. Once acquired and increased—no matter how illicitly—there grows up another furious desire to retain the ill-gotten hoard. There is no glue so sticky as unlawful money. It is almost as easy to wash the dusky sons of Nigritia white, as to wrench stolen money out of a man's hands. He *will* restore it; he can't do so *now*, he *needs* it for his family, etc. Firmly conscience sets its face against the deed; but the rebukes of conscience are met with the declaration: There is no God—for in this case it is desirable there should be none. Be quiet then, conscience. If there is a God at all, he does not mind what men do. He is a soft, good-natured God, full of mercy (minus justice), and will not harm us. The wisest and the richest of monarchs saw the dangers of wealth, and therefore he besought God not to give him wealth; and he added, as the reason of his prayer: Lest perhaps being filled, I should be tempted to deny, and say: "Who is the Lord?" (Prov. 30, v. 8-9). That is, who will take my wealth from me, or hinder me from using it as I please in gluttony and in lust?

St. Ambrose remarks that avarice is a near neighbor to treachery. Long before him St. Paul had said to Timothy (1 Tim. 6, v.



9-10): "They that will become rich fall into temptation and into the snare of the Devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which draw men into destruction and perdition. For the desire of money is the root of all evils; which some coveting have erred from the faith and entangled themselves in many sorrows." The miser does not believe that there is any God in the world to come, and, therefore, in this life he contemns faith and all religion. Nor is it only lust of lucre that slopes down into atheism. Sins of the flesh produce the same disastrous result. Nothing is more commonly inculcated than this truth by the doctors and saints of the Church. And the reason of the assertion lies on the very surface of things. Sins of this description plunge reason into flesh and blood; they blind its eyes and unfit it for the contemplation of divine truth. Christ himself assures us that a clean heart is necessary in order to see God; and the saying need not be wholly restricted to supernatural sight. The animal man does not perceive what is spiritual. St. Thomas counts thoughtlessness, mental blindness and hatred for God among the daughters of lust. Now the nature of hatred is not to see what is most obvious, or if it sees, it passes on, as though it saw not. Who, then, will gainsay that darkness of mind, depravity of the understanding, loss of right reason, inconsiderateness, hatred for God—which are all the offspring of lust—form, chiefly when combined, proximate dispositions for atheism?

Still another sin which puts a man on the down-hill to atheism, is intellectual pride. This form of pride makes one immoderately trust his own abilities and knowledge. For trivial reasons it prefers its own private views to the convictions and demonstrations even of the most learned. It is persuaded that there is no problem which it cannot grasp and thoroughly comprehend. The Holy Ghost tells us that pride is the beginning of all sin, and that the *beginning* of the pride of man is to fall off from God. (Eccl. 10, v. 15, 14.) Hence it would seem that the very first sin pride commits is to reject God, and go over to his enemies. Moreover, it is exceedingly difficult to prove to the intellectually proud anything which runs counter to their ideas. No matter how solid and conclusive your arguments, either they are not considered, or they are contemptuously put aside. They make little of what other men think. The argument in favor of God's existence drawn from the general consent of mankind has no weight in the balance, because what are all the men of past ages alongside of a modern scientist, for instance? Once rid of the human race, the transition to the rejection of all evidence for God is not at all so violent. These intellectual giants are of course daring thinkers; they are the boldest of the Japhetic race. They are fickle too and fond of

novelty. With iron tenacity they cleave to frivolous theories, because these theories are new and run foul of the doctrine generally received among the conservatively learned. The novelties and vapory fabrications are assailed and put to rout. Still the giants keep to their guns. Batter away at them as much as you please, they will not retire from the position that they have taken up. Logic, however, continues inexorable. The proud dogmatizers must be consequent, and concede unpleasant inferences. Therefore, the process goes on until the theorizers find themselves wedged in among the most uncomfortable errors. Like the impatient man of whom St. Austin speaks, they start by asserting that the teasing fly could not be from God, and they have to allow that even the elephant is not from God—nor the world—in fact, that there is no God at all.

Intellectual pride is the grand storehouse of objections against God; indeed without that resource atheism would not have much to say. Amid the blaze of their learning, the patrons of intellectual pride pretend that God's existence should not be accepted, or at least that it should be put on the shelf of doubt. And why so? Because the astronomer cannot see him through his telescope, nor the chemist find him in his old laboratory, or the great wit meet him at an evening party, or the geologist come upon him amid the wrecks of "days that are over." Because, say sour-tempered philosophers, socialists, communists, *we* cannot see how it is consistent with reason, etc., that a God, who is reported to be immeasurably wise, good, powerful, foreseeing, and so forth, should allow so many human beings to live without knowing him, and thus damn themselves for eternity. Why are the good in affliction and the wicked prosperous? Why is there so much evil in this world, etc., etc.? You don't see how all this is. Therefore there is nothing to be said about these points, and there is no God. If you saw something against them, your ideas would be worth attention. It is knowledge that should account for, prove or disprove propositions; not ignorance.

In his *Meditations*, Descartes remarks that all the difficulties raised by atheists come either from their putting human passions in God, or from attempting, with their own narrow little minds, to determine and comprehend fully what God ought to be and to do. Is not this the central sin of multitudes in our own 19th century? Yet philosophers of high standing teach us that we cannot form a comprehensive idea of even the simplest object. At its beginning this world was made so perfect, from the lowest to the sublimest creature, that no man can take in all its beauty, order, unity, and perfection. Our knowledge is far more a learned ignorance, as *à Lapide* calls it, than a complete science. According to St. Thomas,

we cannot exhaust the intelligibility even of a fly. How silly, therefore, to pretend to fathom the infinitely infinite abysses of God! More reasonably might we strive to inclose Atlantic's waters within the palm of our right hand. Ignorance is a splendid reason for us to learn, or to hold our tongues; but it is no motive at all to dogmatize, or even to speak, unless we wish to show what fools we are, or to say an humble, I don't know.

The imperfections of our knowledge are very much to be insisted on among those who rashly fancy their minds to be the measure and *ultima thule* of everything. Such braggarts must learn not to be so highminded (Rom. xi. v. 20), and not to lose sight of their ignorance. The same conduct should be followed with the weak-minded folks, who, Wouter Van Twiller like, fall to doubting God's existence because they are unable to unfold his nature, or detect the ends which led him not to hinder this or that. Learn that your God is unlimited in every kind of perfection, and it is fortunate for us all that he is, otherwise he never could have tolerated our impudence so long. *Patiens quia æternus* is the explanation offered by St. Augustine. God bears with the multitude of our shortcomings, because he remains forever. He will meet us all at the portals of eternity. Meanwhile and forever he is incomprehensible by time, by space, by thought, and by love. Whatever we do about him falls short of him. His judgments cannot be fully understood, and his ways are far beyond the investigations of men.

The next step to atheism is furnished by the politicians. Nor need this excite wonder, for the world is Anti-Christ, and if anything is now the world, surely it is politics. Our author calls this step Machiavellism. What is that? Vasquez, Lessius, together with Machiavelli himself, define it to be a system, teaching that our chief care is to be given to what concerns the external management of the state and of our families, so as to keep the people in order and obedience, and to retain as well as increase family property. Religion, consequently, is to be valued and employed only so far forth as it promotes these ends. From this descriptive definition, it is plain Machiavellism, instead of being only one sin, is an entire crowd of sins; and indeed it involves religious hypocrisy; it prefers the creature to God; the prudence of the flesh to heavenly wisdom. It changes religion according to worldly circumstances, violates oaths, oppresses the innocent, and is ready to commit any crime whatever that may judged fit to secure and aggrandize the state. This theory is a flat contradiction of the precept of Christ in reference to seeking first the kingdom of heaven and its justice. It is statolatry—the State god—that total supremacy in practice and fact, which we witness ourselves, of the temporal over the



eternal. Manifestly this doctrine leads by quite a short-cut to atheism. It snaps its fingers at all religion, and sacrifices it every day for earthly gain. *Quid vultis mihi dare et ego tradam eum*, as the unprincipled Judas said. I am ready to betray Christ for any sum of money, for any position, honor, that you may see fit to bestow on me. I am willing to be a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, a Turk, a worshipper of idols, an atheist even, if that will forward my temporal interests. This code of morals, unfortunately, is not out of practice. Its action and consequences are daily before our eyes.

Grave impatience, under the many trials of life, will lead in the same direction as the sins which have been hitherto mentioned. For wise and lofty reasons God allows these crosses, and will not exempt us from them. Unless, therefore, we are resigned to the divine will, when under pressure, we shall break out into declarations against God's goodness and justice, and even question his existence. A certain intemperance of language, that arises from this impatience, from a fiery imagination, and habitually exaggerated use of words, or some other kindred cause, is not without its danger as regards disbelief of God. This defect indulges in such assertions as, that it is as sure as that God is in heaven, etc. Now it often happens that this wonderfully magnified certainty turns out to be no certainty at all, and people, seeing that what was so confidently and so solemnly asserted cannot be relied on, are exposed to suspect even the most evident truths. Hence our Lord recommends great moderation in speech, and St. Ignatius warns us against violent comparisons, as that such a one is as holy as St. Paul, and the like. The same evil will follow from frequenting the company of unbelievers, and from reading bad books, especially in the case of uneducated or half-educated persons. Long ago the Holy Ghost told us of this danger: Ps. xvii. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 33. In accordance with that teaching the Church prohibits bad books, and excommunicates the obstinate sinner. The same idea was at the bottom of that legislation which would not tolerate heresy in Spain and other countries. Many are altogether too tender towards errors in faith and reason. Forbearance is for the erring, not for error.

Irreverent talk, jesting about sacred things, ludicrous applications of Scripture, should also be avoided. The same can be said of representing religious ceremonies, the parodying of religion's ministers in theatres and at the opera. For as the reading of bad books is equivalent to bad conversation, so this trifling with, perhaps even mocking or jeering at sacred things, lessens respect for the divine and brings it into contempt. With the foregoing we must link fictitious miracles, pretended prophecies, fabricated

visions, trumped up stories about the saints, and the like. Sooner or later these impostures are brought to light, and then they cause the real marvels of religion to be suspected or disbelieved. We know how severe the Church is in judging supernatural occurrences and in canonizing her saints. Perhaps the most difficult concession to be obtained from the Holy See is the approbation of a miracle, or the raising of a holy person to the altars of the Church. Arguments that would pass in almost any other court, are mercilessly rejected in Rome. Hatred for the Religious and the ecclesiastical state in general, is the last dangerous step towards atheism that we shall mention under our first heading. That such hatred is a step towards atheism cannot be doubted. Ecclesiastics and Religious are the ministers of God. To despise them as such is therefore to despise God, who appointed them, and from contempt to total rejection the distance is short.

Some say that the clergy deserve this contempt because they are so bad. But if this reason is to hold, where shall we find contempt enough for the laity, since it is notorious that in their ranks multitudes are bad. Indeed—putting Church history aside—we must allow, for the sake of Protestantism and other heresies, that there have been bad clergymen and bad Religious. Without them where would the sects be? These bad people were the fostering fathers and nursing mothers of all Christian sects. Our sinners and castaways are their saints and progenitors. Whilst they were papists, said Luther, “they had only one devil in them, but so soon as they turned Protestants, every one of them had seven.” But, though we grant that there have been bad living priests and Religious, what vast numbers of them were incontestably holy, and the best friends of humanity! On account of the weakness of men, there will be in the Church, until the end of time, cockle and sound grain, excellent and worthless fishes, wise and foolish virgins. Wickedness was found even among the angels, and myriads of them were dragged from their high estate down to the bottom of hell. We must not despise the Church because of a few who are bad against her will and teaching. The net of the Lord should not be broken on account of a few bad fishes. *Some* offenders are not *all* offenders, unless the whole world is to insist on going to jail. Slanderers of spiritual persons commonly commit a fourfold sin, says St. Thomas. They exaggerate real evil; they present what is doubtful as certain; they invent falsehoods, and pervert the good.

But others will add that the Church is too rich, and that priests are forever hunting for money.

Much could be said in reply to this objection, were we to consider what those who are not priests do in order to procure dollars and cents. However, we shall let that side of the question alone. Who

has ever done for the Christian Church what David, Solomon, and other Jews did for the famous temple at Jerusalem? Giving money to churches is an old practice, and St. Paul ordains it. He took up collections, and bade those who serve the altar to live by it. What has not the heathen done for his idols and the Mohammedan for his prophet? The early Christians were profuse in their liberality to God's house, and God killed some people for hiding their goods from the Apostles. It is all very well to exclaim with the impious old poet:

“Dicite pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum!”

For may we not ask, what has gold to do with your body, your furniture, or the harness of your horses? What have the stars to do in the heavens, flowers in the fields, gems in the ocean? What has gold to do in churches? It does what you ought to do, it serves the Maker of all things; it enriches and beautifies his dwelling among men. Besides, the world has not left much gold in churches. An old sinner, in Sicily, once took a gold cloak from Jupiter, with the remark that it was too heavy in summer and too cold for winter. It is true that loftier motives impel modern robbers. They plunder in the name of law, liberty, and toleration. Their depredations, however, force the priest to seek money in order to build, to repair, and to support churches, for people must have them. If you are scandalized at priests asking for money, give it without being asked. You are free to endow churches, schools, colleges, hospitals, asylums, etc., for which, Sunday after Sunday, the priest has to go through the drudgery of begging for money. Give the money, and you will get what you need, far more, the sturdy preaching of the Gospel. If the priest does not beg, nothing can be originated or kept up in a parish; people will say he has no life, no zeal in him. The priest, too, has a man's nature about him, and he cannot live on the four winds or the Holy Ghost alone. Very often this talk about money-making priests, is indulged in chiefly by those, who have a wonderfully cheap way of serving God. What would these tender consciences do were they under the Jewish law, that gave so largely to priests and Levites? If anything, the priests of the New Law are more perfect, higher in dignity, and consequently they ought to receive more. Remember, though, that the eating of Church property is among the deadliest of poisons, for states as well as for individuals. And here ends our first part. What remains to be said is far shorter.

Our second member asserts that heresy is a highroad to atheism.

At first heresy meant the adoption of a doctrine, whether true



or false. At present, its common meaning is the choice of an erroneous doctrine in religion, or that wrong doctrine itself. It is defined as a wilful and obstinate error in matters regarding the Catholic faith, in one professing to be a Christian. From this definition heresy plainly opens a wide avenue to atheism. Being an error it can afford no objective certainty. It is founded on private judgment, and in religious matters particularly, that is a copious source of falsehood. It gives the lie to God and to his messenger. It pretends to know revelation without its sole accredited witness, the Catholic Church. But let us descend to special heresies. The one which teaches that salvation is attainable in any Christian sect, is unquestionably a gate to atheism. For it must advocate every absurdity on account of the hundreds of conflicting religions; and if an absurd religion does not beget scorn for all religion and for God himself, what can do so? Among other enormities, Calvinism makes God far more the author of sin than any sinning man, even than the Devil himself is; since God is the chief and independent absolute agent in every act. It says likewise that God foreordains some to hell, and commands what is impossible for man. Surely such doctrine is atheistic. Luther taught the above-mentioned errors of Calvin as well as a host of others. He absolved men from the necessity of good works. Therefore Luther too is favorable to atheism. And what is true of these heresies is applicable to all others, at least in so far as they reject God's authority. Thus we close our second part.

The third part of our division is concerned with erroneous views in the field of philosophy, whether mental or moral. It can also take in unsound opinions in theology. The first that we have here to put in line is, that noted raider on philosophy, named Descartes. This man had a doubt, which he called methodic, because, perhaps, there was method in his madness. At all events he said, that to begin philosophy, which, if anything at all is, we suppose, the certain and harmonious knowledge of truth—we should place ourselves in a state of universal doubt about all things. Then our minds would be free from prejudices, and ready for ethereal truth. But if that doubt is accepted, it must apply to God, since according to some, belief in him is a terrible prejudice. Descartes also says, "that God can cause two and two not to be four, or change the essence of things." He slights the arguments advanced by theologians and philosophers in proof of God's existence, and loftily replaces them by some of his own excogitating, which he considers more certain than any demonstration in geometry. Our old book thus photographs Descartes. He was a soldier, and gave up the army to become a philosopher. He knew nothing except some mathematics; nor was he a man of much judgment. His

acquaintance with logic was slight, and in philosophy he had not advanced far. He was fonder of novelty than of truth, and cared more for a widespread name than for a good one. He entertained a grand opinion of himself, and affected moderation in everything. Yet the fires of his inborn pride broke out whenever he met with opposition. He was not always consistent in stating, or in supporting his views.

Descartes has had the misfortune to draw upon himself the panegyrics of heretics. It was his sad privilege to devastate in philosophy every department that he entered. He treated logic, and he ruined it by his methodic doubt. He meddled with Critica, and he shattered its principles by his subjective evidence. He entered ontology, and he shook its foundations by making the essences of things depend on the free-will of God. He ventured on cosmology, and annihilated corporeal substance by allowing it nothing beyond its threefold dimensions. He dealt with physics, and he stripped it of all beauty and variety, by reducing everything within its domains to pure motion and matter. He introduced into ideology the false theory of innate ideas. He nullified the human compound by lowering the soul to the mere office of mover to the body. He disturbed the fundamental idea of psychology by representing the soul as only a simple unextended being.—*Civiltà Cattolica*, July 5th, 1862, p. 40. Still, this intellectual rioting has not prevented Descartes' trumpeters from blaring him out as the creator of philosophical science and the first man that ever demonstrated the spirituality of the soul. O, poor human brains! What mental aberrations have been witnessed since the scholastic philosophy was driven from the schools. But Descartes and Malebranche are gradually sinking to the low level which they should always have occupied.

Another open road to atheism, is the denial of the soul's immortality. Irreligion under every form and moral filth can then follow. The attributes of God are destroyed, because there is no fitting reward for virtue or vices. God, who has taught the immortality of the soul, is made a liar, and therefore, he is no God. Would the soul be intellectual, could she know God at all, were she purely mortal?

The theory so common, even in our own day, that people can lawfully believe as they please, and go from one religion to another at will, is evidently atheistic. Even Beza himself said, that such freedom of conscience was only leave granted to all men to go to hell; that it was a doctrine of Satan, a liberty of the Devil. Whoso permits God to be blasphemed, really acknowledges and loves no God. If he did, he would defend his God and his Church. He would not tolerate the enemies of God, nor make laws to have Him blasphemed.

But we must end our enumeration of the steps to atheism. Every one will confess that the steps mentioned issue in atheism. These steps show that at its origin, atheism is not quite so respectable as some would have us believe. It is not the child of pure intellect and science. On the contrary, in a multitude of instances, its parentage is low and disreputable. A sot, a libertine, a rebel to reason, truth, faith, can be an atheist; never a man of reason or of faith. There is, therefore, in atheism, nothing to be proud of. A witty French lady said, to a would-be gentleman, who in her presence paraded his ungodliness, "You are not alone, sir, in your way of thinking; my dog is also an atheist."

As long as reason remains no one can prove that there is no God. Hence, according to Scripture, it is only the fool that can say there is no God, and even if he says so, he says it in his *heart*, not in his *head* or *mind*, for the mind of itself can never come to that degree of madness. There are, indeed, many moral atheists, that is to say, men who without any reason, and solely from passion, from the desire that there should be no God, say there is no God. Hence a good confession is often the greatest destroyer of atheism. And it is a thing those afflicted with should hastily put away from them. It can lead only to hell, though even there the doctrine is not fashionable.

Should any one, who chances to read these pages, have taken any of the foregoing steps, let him withdraw on the instant. The grandest honor for man on this earth, or anywhere else, is to believe, love, and serve God.

---



## THE PURSUIT OF "JOSEPH."

LATE in the fall of 1876 a band of the Nez Percé Indians, on their way from their homes west of the mountains to the "Buffalo country," stopped for a day or two at the post of Fort Shaw. The various bands inhabiting the western part of Montana and Eastern Idaho have been accustomed, for many years, to make this trip for procuring supplies of buffalo meat. Coming east in the fall, they remain amongst the buffalo during the winter, and return to the west in the spring. This visit was, therefore, no novelty to the garrison of Fort Shaw, and derived its interest from future events, for the Chief of the band was the since celebrated "*Looking Glass*."

The chiefs called upon the commanding officer, as usual, were kindly received and supplied with some necessary provisions, which, singular to say, they never *asked* for, but always took. They were invited to give us an exhibition of a *sham* battle. To this they consented, and, at the hour appointed, the whole garrison turned out, when the distant shots and loud yells of the warriors were heard as they approached the post from their camp down the river. Firing their pieces in the air and uttering their peculiar yells, they approached the post in a motley crowd, their horses prancing, their drums beating and their gay, painted feathers fluttering in the breeze. After marching in this fashion entirely around the garrison, to show off their gay trappings and hideously painted faces, they assembled for the fight on the prairie outside the post. Dividing into two parties, they went through the manœuvres of a supposed conflict, charging and firing at each other, advancing and retreating, tumbling from their horses to simulate the killed and wounded, and now and then dismounting to fight on foot, when they jumped about like so many capering monkeys, all the time uttering the most frightful yells. The whole thing was looked upon by the spectators as a most ridiculous farce, and the remark was frequently heard, "If they do not fight better than that when they get into a real battle, they will not do much harm to the enemy." Many of those looking on, had occasion afterwards to recall this reflection, and an incident of the sham battle, regarded as peculiarly farcical at the time, was strongly impressed upon our minds by after events. During a pause in the conflict, the half-breed interpreter approached me and asked for some *rags*. On inquiring as to what he wanted with them, he said "to make a fire." I suggested a handful of hay. This was obtained, and when the battle recommenced, an Indian, crawling up towards the opposition

party, deposited his hay, and with a match set it on fire. The wind being favorable, the smoke was carried into the faces of the enemy, and behind it the now victorious party charged forward with loud yells, and drove their enemy from the field in wild confusion, and thus ended the fight. This incident, derisively looked upon as child's play at the time, many of us had occasion afterwards to recall under more serious circumstances.

In the following June, reports began to reach us of hostilities having broken out among the Nez Percés, west of the mountains. The region where the first conflicts between the troops and the Indians took place, is not only west of the main divide of the Rocky Mountains, but west of the Bitter Root range, a high, rugged range, running north and south, over which passes, for nearly one hundred miles, a rough, difficult mountain trail, known as the "Lon Lon" pass, the trail entering the Bitter Root valley a few miles above the town of Missoula, Montana Territory. The difficulties of the trail are graphically described in the journal of Lewis and Clarke, who passed over it seventy-one years ago, and named the stream issuing from it to the eastward, "Traveller's Rest Creek;" for here their expedition rested one day before encountering the perils of the trail, after their trip down the *Bitter Root*, by them named Clarke's River.

Early in June two small companies of infantry had been sent from Fort Shaw, to establish a post near the town of Missoula, and between that place and the mouth of "Traveller's Rest Creek," or Lon Lon Fork. This was the only post in Western Montana, and the nearest one to the scene of hostilities.

To meet any emergency in Montana, the number of troops available was very small, for all the cavalry, comprising one half the strength in the Territory, had early in the spring been ordered for service down the Yellowstone River. This left for our sole dependence ten companies of infantry, occupying five different posts and scattered for a distance, north and south, of some 250 miles, with the outlying post near Missoula, nearly that distance to the westward.

On the first report that the hostiles were moving eastward, one company was hastily dispatched in wagons from Fort Ellis, and after a rapid march, reached Missoula, but not until after the Indians had succeeded in passing into the Bitter Root valley. This took away every available soldier from Fort Ellis, and immediately afterwards, on the receipt of positive intelligence that the Nez Percés were moving over the Lon Lon trail, a concentration of troops at Fort Shaw from the posts of Fort Benton and Camp Baker was ordered. This concentration was effected on the 27th of July, and the following day the little force, consisting of seven

officers and seventy-six men, filed out of Fort Shaw, followed by its pack-mules, and took up its march for Missoula, 150 miles distant. As we were to march via Cadotte's Pass, and now knew its location (see last paper) we were able to strike for it in a "bee line," which in a country like this, intersected with hills and valleys, is not quite as straight as the "crow flies." Our mules, unaccustomed to packing, gave a good deal of trouble, and no one knows, except after trial, what trouble an obstinate mule *can* give under the pack or *over* it, when he puts his whole mind to it. In consequence, the first day's march was short. Several of the mules, apparently coming to the conclusion that they preferred a comfortable stable and plenty of grain at Fort Shaw, to a life in the open air and scant grass, after scattering their loads of bacon and hard tack over the prairie, galloped back to the post, and it was past midnight before they were recaptured and taken back to camp.

It was late the next day before we reached the Dearborn River, twenty-five miles distant. Here we nooned for three hours, feasting on delicious fresh trout caught from the bright, clear, cold stream, and then resumed the march towards the mountains, following the trail leading towards Cadotte's Pass. As the shadows of approaching sunset commenced to fall across our path, we bivouacked for the night well up towards the mountains, having dispatched our little party of mounted men across the summit as an advance guard; for it was desirable to get ahead as rapidly as possible. The route up the Big Blackfoot (the Cokalahishkit of Lewis and Clarke) from Missoula and through Cadotte's Pass was the shortest and usual route followed by the Indians coming across the mountains, and if these hostiles succeeded in eluding or overpowering the small force near Missoula they would in all probability meet us somewhere on this trail. Our force being so small it was a matter of some importance that we should have early intelligence of their approach, and a choice of position to resist them.

The next morning we resumed the march, gradually rising as the trail entered the mountains, until we reached the foot of the steep hill which led up to the summit, where we encountered the snow-storm six years ago in our trip from the west, and at length, after a steep climb of a mile or more stood again upon the summit of the Rocky Mountains. There had been a slight rain the night before and the day was cold and cloudy, so that we felt but little disposition to stay and enjoy the view which opened out to the eastward. We quickly descended the slope on the other side and halted to rest and lunch at a little clear stream, which trickled from the mountain-side towards its long voyage to the great Columbia. Our route now lies down a pretty but narrow little



valley, shut in by dense masses of timber, which cover the hills on every side to their very summits. We noon, shortly after striking the main Blackfoot, which comes out of a deep gorge from the south, and simply out of curiosity, but with no hope of catching anything, I put my rod together and cast a fly upon the glassy surface of a deep pool close by our stopping-place. It has scarcely touched the water before, with a rush and a splash, a good-sized trout breaks the surface, seizes it, and is landed after a short struggle, a speckled beauty, on the grass; an ample "string" soon rewards a short walk along the stream. During the day we had started up along the trail numerous coveys of the beautiful blue or mountain grouse, the young of which is now just fit for the table; and, with plenty of these, and fresh trout just from the water, we had no cause to complain either of the quality or quantity of our noonday meal.

We pushed ahead in the afternoon, being anxious to get beyond the junction of our trail with that through Lewis and Clarke's Pass lest the Indians, if on the road, should give us the slip by that route. The valley now begins to widen out more, and in search of grouse I wander from the main trail with shot-gun in hand and followed by an orderly carrying a rifle. I have just passed a little grove of green quaking asp, and am thinking of nothing in particular, when casting my eyes to the left they encountered a sight which caused me instantly to check my horse and grasp my gun. There, not fifty yards away, lies a fine young white-tailed buck, his thick velvety horns turned directly towards me and his great eyes staring as if questioning my right to intrude on his solitude. Strange to say, he makes no effort to rise, but lies there in his noonday bed looking at me. Quickly unlocking my breech-loader I slip out the small shot cartridges, and seize a buckshot wire cartridge, several of which I always carry in my belt; but it is somewhat worn, and in my feverish attempt to force it in it gets jammed and the block refuses to close. I fear some sort of exclamation must have escaped me, for the deer not liking the look of affairs slowly rose to his feet and stalked off, the most beautiful and graceful animal I ever looked upon. Hastily jumping from my horse, and dropping my gun on the ground, I ran back a few paces to the orderly, took my rifle from him, slipped in a cartridge, and hastened back to my former position, just in time to catch sight of the deer slowly moving through the timber, and not yet aware of the fact that he was treading upon dangerous ground. A sharp crack of the rifle echoed through the woods, there was a hurried rush and a plunge, and the magnificent fat buck fell, almost at the feet of my orderly, shot through the heart. That night our bill of fare had broiled venison steaks added to it.

We passed the trail leading into Lewis and Clarke's Pass without seeing any sign of Indians, and followed down the now enlarged Blackfoot through a wide open valley, dotted here and there with groves of magnificent pine trees towering a hundred feet above our heads. We bivouacked in one of these late in the afternoon, and in the midst of a heavy rain, which continued during the night, soaking everything thoroughly, and sadly interfering with sleep. The stream is literally filled with fine large trout, and enough were obtained to supply the wants of the whole command.

The next day opened with rain, but it soon cleared off, and the men having now got on their marching legs, moved along at a rapid gait, passing Lincoln Gulch, a mining settlement, and entering the narrow cañon of the Blackfoot below. Here I received a courier from Helena with news from Missoula, that the Nez Percés, finding Captain Rawn's little force entrenched in the cañon of the Lon Lon Fork, had displayed a force in his front, and then with their main body marched around his position over the hills, out of range of his rifles, and entered the valley of the Bitter Root in his rear. There was great excitement in the settlements, and much apprehension of an approaching conflict, but a later dispatch received from Captain Rawn informed me that the citizens who had accompanied him as volunteers to the Lon Lon Pass had returned home, after making an agreement with the Indians that their lives and property should be safe. The Nez Percés had then moved up the Bitter Root valley away from the direction of Missoula.

The important question now with us was, which way were they going? Knowing that their natural route lay along the one we were travelling, I rather anticipated they would move *down* the Bitter Root and up this trail, but I knew also that they would never enter on such a mountain pass incumbered with their women, children, and herds, without thoroughly scouting ahead to see that the coast was clear. When, therefore, the soldier who brought me the dispatch from Captain Rawn stated that he had met on the trail, and travelled with for some miles, nine armed Indians, who told him they were Nez Percés, and were going across the country to join Joseph's band on the Bitter Root, he telling them that he was coming up the trail to meet me, I felt well assured they would not bring their camp by this route, unless, pressed by General Howard from the rear, they should feel themselves compelled to attack my small force to clear the road in front of them. Hence we pushed ahead more rapidly than ever, and after leaving the cañon camped in the open prairie on the borders of a beautiful lake, having marched twenty-seven miles.

The following day, August 1st, we continued the march through a high, rolling, open prairie, filled with little streams and lakes, and

dotted all over with little rounded knolls or knobs, and as I rose a prominent hill, a light suddenly dawned upon me. As far as the eye could reach in every direction, and bounded only by the wooded hills which bordered the prairie, the surface was one continued series of *knobs*; and I then recalled the description given by Captain Lewis: "From the multitude of knobs irregularly scattered through this country, Captain Lewis called it the Prairie of the Knobs." There could be no question about it. This was the spot referred to, and in fancying that I had discovered in the expedition six years ago,<sup>1</sup> the place so named by Captain Lewis, I was in error. For hours we travelled through this plain landmark, so aptly named by Captain Clarke, and nooned at the mouth of a fine large stream, which he calls the North Fork of the Cokalashashkit, and up which a trail leads to the head of Jocko valley, where is located the agency for the Flathead Indians. Our route now, for some distance, lies over some very steep, thickly wooded hills, where our animals labor a good deal on the steep ascents and amidst the thickly fallen timber. The day's march was very hot and tedious, and it was nearly sundown before we halted for the night, after making only twenty-four miles. Here I received another dispatch from Captain Rawn, dated that morning, and informing me that the Indians were moving very slowly up the Bitter Root valley. They are evidently in no hurry to leave, and I think are quietly waiting to see what the troops are going to do, and they will have ample notice, for their scouts are out in every direction, and they are informed of everything that occurs in the valley, and even what the white people themselves know. Captain Rawn also sends me a dispatch, just received from General Howard, and dated July 25th. The General states that he will start in pursuit from Kamisch five days afterwards (the 30th). These are five precious days, and the Indians have already made their escape from the pass before the pursuers have entered it. From what I learned afterwards in the Bitter Root valley, the Indians were fully aware of their danger, and of the necessity for haste to get out of the pass, for a number of them, in their free talks with the settlers, said with an air of triumph, "We have got you scared now; a few days ago you had us scared," alluding to when they were in the pass, with Captain Rawn entrenched before them, and, as they thought, General Howard coming up behind them.

The next day, August 2d, we made an early start, and leaving the infantry to follow, I hastened ahead toward Missoula, reported to be fifty miles distant. The trail now once again left the open country, and entered a gorge of the mountains, the scenery becom-

---

<sup>1</sup> See preceding paper.



ing wilder and more grand at every step. For miles we were compelled to climb and descend steep mountain-sides on a trail just wide enough for the passage of a single animal, and rendered in places hazardous from loose stones or fallen timber, which sadly tried the strength of our pack-mules and weary horses. The Blackfoot, now a considerable stream, tumbles along hundreds of feet beneath us, whilst on every side mountain peaks tower above our heads. In many places the slopes are so steep that all are compelled to dismount and lead the horses. We stop for an hour to rest and graze our weary animals, and then push ahead again, and near 12 o'clock, when about to stop for a nooning, meet another courier from Captain Rawn, saying the Indians are still in the valley, moving very slowly southward, and evidently watching the whole valley with their scouts. On the report of the courier, that Missoula was only five miles distant, I concluded to push ahead without stopping. But the trail had become still more rough and difficult; we are obliged to travel slowly, and rejoice when we emerge from the mountains and look down upon a level plateau which marks the junction of the Blackfoot with the Hell Gate River, or according to Lewis and Clarke (whose baptismal names should be retained), the forks of the Eastern Fork of Clarke's River and the Cokałahashkit. For the first time since leaving Lincoln Gulch, we see a house, and a ride of a mile or two through a valley, dotted with farm-houses and grain-fields, where the harvesters are at work, brings us to the little town of Missoula, pleasantly situated on a bright, clear stream, which empties into the Hell Gate, close to the town. After a short halt to get the news, we pass on to the post, which we reach late in the afternoon, after a hard ride of over fifty miles. Lieutenant Bradley, with his mounted party, got in before sundown, and we only awaited the arrival of the infantry, to take up our line of march up the Bitter Root valley. By sending wagons out to the point where the trail emerges from the mountains, the tired infantrymen reached the post at 4 P.M. of the 3d.

Immediately on my arrival I sent a messenger to Charlo, the chief of a band of Flatheads, living up the valley of the Bitter Root, inviting him to come and see me. He arrived the next morning, and through an interpreter I opened the talk with him, by stating that the whole valley was filled with Nez Percé scouts, who were acting as spies, that he and his people were the only ones who knew these Indians and could distinguish them from friendly Indians, and that I wanted his young warriors to go out, capture these spies, and bring them in to me as prisoners. Charlo is a quiet, pleasant-faced Indian, and had very little to say. What he did say, however, was to the point, and to the effect that he and his people were friends to the whites, but that in the present struggle

between them and the Nez Percés he could not take sides, and firmly declined to do what I wished. He left the next morning for his camp near Stevensville, and I was obliged to commence the movement up the valley, fearing that the first step we took would be observed by the Nez Percé scouts and promptly reported to their chief. Hoping, however, that there were more of them in the lower part of the valley, and that I might gain one day on them, the command was not started from the post until one o'clock P.M., when, with every man to be spared from the post, the whole loaded in wagons, we pulled out on the road. Crossing the Bitter Root (Clarke's) River on a bridge and moving up the west bank over a good road, we passed the mouth of the Lon Lon Fork, where seventy years ago the Lewis and Clarke expedition rested for a day or two on "Traveller's Rest Creek," and then separated into two parties, the one under Captain Lewis to follow the route we had just passed over, the other under Captain Clarke to pursue that we were about to follow, and to rejoin each other on the Great Missouri River below the mouth of the Yellowstone.

The march was continued far into the night, and it was nearly eleven o'clock before the command reached its halting-place near Stevensville, about twenty-seven miles distant. It was long after dark when I reached there considerably ahead of the command, after passing Fort Owens, a stockade, inside of which were huddled a promiscuous crowd of men, women, and children, who in fear and trembling had sought safety there from anticipated hostilities. The arrival of the soldiers was a great relief to these poor people, and at the same time created a great excitement. As we rode into Stevensville the loud barking of the dogs brought out all the inhabitants still remaining in the place. The town is located at the mouth of the "Scattering Creek" of Lewis and Clarke, and near it is a Catholic mission, to which one of the citizens offered to guide me in the dark. This man proved to be a discharged soldier from my regiment, and was afterwards of great service in guiding us to the Nez Percé camp. On reaching the Mission, surrounded by the teepees of Charlo's band of the Flatheads, I was hospitably received by the priest in charge, and sat in his room till the arrival of the command. The head priest of the mission, Father R., had been confined for a long time previous to his bed by illness, from which he was not yet recovered. His reputation as a successful *physician* was widespread, and having heard so much of him I was glad to receive an invitation to visit him in his chamber. Following the attending priest through an adjacent room I was introduced into one beyond, barely large enough to contain a small bed, a table, and a chair. Here, propped up in the bed, and *reading medicine* by the light of a dim lamp, was a charming old Frenchman, who with a

skull-cap on his head and a pair of glasses on his nose, received me with all the graceful cordiality of a past age, which his thirty-five years' residence in the wilderness had failed to obliterate. I was much attracted by the charms of his conversation, and sat talking to him for some time. He informed me that he had come to this country with the celebrated Father De Smet thirty-five years ago, and whilst wondering in my worldly way whether he had not probably gotten about tired of it he said, evidently with the utmost sincerity, "I thank God I shall in time lay my bones amongst these poor Indians." I did not say so to this good priest, but I could not help reflecting how different, under the present circumstances, my ambition was from his.

He gave me a great deal of information in regard to the Nez Percés, who had remained in this vicinity for some days, frequently visiting the town and freely trading with the inhabitants. In the course of conversation he asked me "how many troops I had." Now my experience with human nature, whether embodied in the form of soldiers or not, teaches me that there is a great indisposition to confess one's *weakness*, even when the confessor is a priest, and so I answered in a general way, "About two hundred." "Ah," said the old man, "you *must* not attack them, you have not enough. They are bad Indians, they are splendid shots, are well armed, have plenty of ammunition, and have at least two hundred and sixty warriors." I wonder what that brave old priest, who had voluntarily submitted to so long a banishment in the wilderness, would have said had I told him that "our duty might require some of us at least to *lay our bones amongst these poor Indians*." I parted with this charming old gentleman with much regret, and shall probably never see him again, but I can never forget the grace of his manner, which was so strongly contrasted by his surroundings, his solicitude for our welfare and safety, and his urgent invitation to call upon him when I came back.

Our camp that night was a sorry one. Very little wood was to be had, the camp-ground was bare of vegetation and dusty, and we went supperless to bed, our animals not much better off than we were, for although allowed to wander forth at large during the night they found scant means of gratifying their hunger in the bare waste which surrounded us. The night was cold, and the next morning, although the camp was astir early, we did not start till 6.30, and before leaving had free communication with some of the citizens, who came to our camp, and we thus picked up a good many items in regard to the Nez Percés.

We were told that during their presence in the vicinity they freely traded with the whites for provisions of all kinds, offering in exchange good prices in gold coin, dust, and greenbacks, which



the whites did not trouble themselves to reflect were stained with the blood of the peaceful settlers of a neighboring Territory. One scoundrel who visited our camp, I was told, boastfully claimed to have made a profit of \$500, in gold, in his trade with this band of murderers and thieves! They also traded off a number of horses and mules captured from our troops in Idaho and stolen from the settlers there, whilst watches and jewelry of different kinds were sold at fabulously low prices. It was even hinted that metallic ammunition was one of the items traded by the whites for these ill-gotten gains.

Some of the people complained bitterly of the action of a self-constituted committee, which it was said had taken upon itself the powers of a vigilance committee, and adopted a resolution that should any white man be charged with an offence against an Indian, he should at once be turned over to the Indians for punishment! We were also informed that when the Nez Percés first came up the valley, many of the inhabitants flocked with their goods to the inclosure at Fort Owens, where a considerable number still remained huddled together as I have mentioned. On the report, however, that the Indians were disposed to be peaceful, and that a brisk trade had been opened with them, goods were hurriedly loaded into wagons at Fort Owens and pushed forward to the scene of traffic, the owners being anxious not to lose the advantages of this new and unexpected market. Whether or not these reports were all true to the disgraceful extent we heard we had no time to ascertain, but the next day brought us into a moral atmosphere of a more healthy tone.

We resumed our trip up the valley, now well settled up with ranches and farms, though far from being as rich and productive as we had been led to expect. At the little town of Corvallis we stopped to noon and gather further news of the Indians, who generally had up to this time committed very few depredations and spilled no blood. The poor women and children were here found gathered behind the protecting walls of a well-built sod fort, which the hostiles had looked at and commented upon as they passed, evidently pleased at the scare they had created, and comparing it with their own scare when shut in the Lon Lon cañon. Parties of them had visited the town and attempted to trade at the stores, but their reception was in marked contrast to that met with lower down the valley. A Mr. Young, who kept a store in the place, met their advances to trade with a flat refusal, closed his doors and told the Indians plainly that their money was blood-stained and he wanted none of it. They were very saucy, and threatened to burn down his house, but the brave old man stood firm and dared them to do their worst. Although some of the more desperate ones

urged extreme measures, they were dissuaded by the more moderate, and the old hero was left master of the field, with the proud satisfaction of knowing his conscience was clear though at the expense of his pocket. After crossing the Bitter Root again, at a ford, we encamped on its bank about sundown, having made about thirty miles. Here we were joined by six citizens, who volunteered to accompany us. Amongst the number was Mr. Joe Blodget, who lived in the immediate neighborhood, was well acquainted with the upper valley, and had been recommended to me as the best guide in the country. He fully came up to his reputation, and proved of inestimable value to the expedition. To his frontier qualities as a good shot and a fine hunter, was added an intimate knowledge of every part of the trail up the valley and across the main divide of the Rocky Mountains into the Big Hole Basin. My first question to him was, "How far can we take our wagons?" to which he replied, "All the way through to Bannock, if you want to." I looked at him in astonishment, for I had been informed positively that beyond a certain point wagons could not go, and had, therefore, brought along our pack-saddles, intending when the time came to cut loose from the wagons and take to our pack-mules. I asked him if he was sure of what he said. When I became better acquainted with "Joe" Blodget, I never found it necessary to ask him that question in reference to any assertion he made regarding the country we were passing through. He assured me that although the trail was rough and steep in places, he had himself brought lightly loaded wagons all the way over the divide from Bannock. With this assurance we made an early start the next morning, and pushed ahead up the valley, following directly on the trail of the Indians, who on their march up had kept their main camp and herd on the west bank of the river. The trail was plainly marked and very large, showing the presence of a great number of animals, but no indication of either lodge-poles or the poles of "travois," on which Indians are accustomed to carry their wounded. The camps through which we passed during the day and the two following ones showed that the poles used for the teepees, and left standing in the camps, were collected each day for temporary use, and were not carried along on the march, the Indians being thus able to move much more lightly.

Our road continued good, although we crossed several large tributary streams coming in from the west, and forded the main stream three times, and it was one o'clock before we reached Lockwood's ranch, the last house up the Bitter Root valley. Here we stopped to noon, get dinner, and rest and graze our animals. Mr. Lockwood, the owner of the ranche, was with us, having with his family left his home, and sought safety in one of the forts lower

down the valley. On now returning to it he had occasion to recognize the futility of the truce between the Indians and the inhabitants of the Bitter Root valley. His house inside was a perfect wreck. Trunks were broken open and their contents scattered about, whilst furniture, crockery, and everything perishable was broken up and strewed over the place in every direction. The Indians appear to have been kept under very good control whilst in the lower valley, and I presume this mischief was done by some straggling party, or possibly by the rear guard, who may have felt unable to resist the inclination, just as they were leaving, of giving the white man a specimen of their vindictiveness. Blodget tells me that they paid his place a visit and carried off a number of things, including a favorite *coffee-pot*, which he was "bound to get back or its equivalent." Some of the citizens who accompanied us have been scouting ahead, and report that at nine o'clock this morning the Indians were in Ross's Hole, a distance of one day's march ahead of us. Feeling sure that the chiefs were kept fully advised by their scouts of every step we took, my hopes of getting a blow at them were very remote, unless by speedy movements and a surprise; the character of the country ahead being such as would prevent my column from being seen at any great distance. When I found, however, that they were not increasing their speed at all, and seldom marched more than twelve miles a day, the question of overtaking them by marching double that distance was simply one of time, provided we remained undiscovered, and these relative distances remained the same.

The trail of the Indians still continued up the bank of the river, and a short distance above Lockwood's ranche, the smoke of their old camp-fire, probably two nights old, was seen. Just at this point what is known as the southern Nez Percé trail came in from the west, and it was possible that by this trail the Indians may have received some accession to their number from straggling bands coming from the Clearwater country. As the camps in front of us had now passed this trail, it was evident the Indians had no intention, as was at one time feared, of returning by it to Idaho.

This point of the trail is of interest from the fact that here, on the 4th of September, 1806, the Lewis and Clarke expedition first struck the valley of the Bitter Root, the river being named after Captain Clarke, "he," says the *Journal*, "being the first white man who had ever visited its waters." The *Journal* describes the first meeting with the Indians of this valley, who were undoubtedly Flatheads, and whose descendants still occupy it. Victor, the father of the present chief, Charlo, lived until only a few years ago, and was present at this meeting of Lewis and Clarke. From "Joe" Blodget, who knew him well, I received many interesting reminiscences of the,



to the Indians, important event. He says that Victor had often described to him this first meeting with white men, and how from their pale faces they supposed they were *cold*, and covered them with robes.<sup>1</sup> He also told a story which I suspect had a more modern origin, as I do not think friction-matches had at that day been invented. The story goes that one of the white men whilst in the council took a little piece of wood from his pocket and scratching it upon a stone a flame burst forth, much to the amazement of the Indians, who immediately pronounced the white man "great medicine." Apocryphal or not, the incident may well serve to illustrate how the ignorance of a primitive mind would readily attribute to some supernatural cause a thing so simple to us as the ignition of a friction-match.

In imitation of Captain Clarke, we are now, instead of turning into this trail to the west, going to keep on up the Bitter Root, as he did on his way back the next year, and cross the main divide of the Rocky Mountains into the Big Hole Basin, this route being shorter and much better, Captain Clarke says, "than that by which we had advanced in the fall;" to which I add, the Lord help the *other* route!

We were now compelled to cease following the Indian trail, and take our wagons over a formidable ridge, which rose to the eastward of us, its top crowned with dense forests of pine. Shortly after three o'clock we left the river bottom and commenced to pull up a long steep incline, and the farther we went the longer and steeper it appeared to become. Slowly and laboriously we toiled our way up foot by foot, and at length stood upon the crest of a hill fully a mile long, only to find other hills almost as formidable rising up on the road ahead of us. If you want to know how to try the most amiable of tempers (if you are blessed with such), place yourself in a position where haste is of the utmost importance and where also you find yourself utterly unable to make *any* thing move faster than a sloth. You may possibly be able to fancy how trying is such a position to a temper not the most amiable in the world. However, there was nothing to do but to follow the example of the ant and keep on toiling, which we did, rising hill after hill until we thought it high time that we were approaching the top. But on expressing some such opinion to Joe, he pointed to a *mountain* which rose far above our heads to the right, and said in his quiet way: "The trail goes right over the top of that." We had now passed beyond the timber-line and continued to pull up hill after hill, the trail being in places so obscure that without the assistance of a guide

---

<sup>1</sup> This incident is mentioned in the Journal.

who knew its location it would have been utterly out of the question to follow it even with the speed we did. The sun was now rapidly approaching the snow-clad mountains in the west, and from our guide's description of the road ahead of us it soon became apparent that we would not be able to reach the summit that night, much less descend the slope on the other side as we had hoped. The disappointment, great as it was, did not prevent us from viewing with delight the magnificent scene spread out before us. From the ridge we stood upon, which appeared to be almost on a level with the snow-covered mountains opposite to us on the other side of the valley, the eye could trace down the valley of the Bitter Root the trail upon which we had come, and little clouds of dust at intervals along it showed us where parties of horsemen, volunteers from the valley, were hastening forward to join us. Beyond the valley heavily wooded mountain peaks towered one above the other, culminating in one whose rocky gorges, bare of timber, were filled with immense glaciers, the smooth glassy surfaces of which glistened in the rays of the setting sun, presenting to the eye an Arctic scene in strong contrast with that which immediately surrounded us. On the other side of us, stretching eastward as far as the eye could reach, was one continuous mass of timbered hills, with one isolated bare peak rising above the whole, in the direction of, and near, our guide says, the town of Deer Lodge, sixty or seventy miles away as the crow flies.

Impatient at our slow progress I rode ahead some distance to see what the prospect was, and after winding about through the thick timber and climbing several formidable hills, I reached the foot of one steeper than any we had yet met with, and still not the last one, and giving the thing up in despair reluctantly gave the order to go into camp. Our last wagon got in just at dark, and with no water for drinking or making coffee, and of course none for the animals, we laid down to rest, with many misgivings as to whether the latter, turned loose as most of them had to be, would not desert us during the night in search for water, of which they stood much in need after their hard and constant pull up the mountain. Fortunately we were able, with our sentinels, to keep them in camp, and shortly after four o'clock the next morning we were under way again, of course without breakfast, and pulling up the steep hills in front of us. With all the speed we could make, men assisting with drag-ropes, it was four hours before the last of our wagons reached the summit, the top of the mountain pointed out to us the evening before by Blodget.

And now our work, although still no child's play, became easier, and we rolled along down the steep slope of the mountain, removing the fallen timbers as we went along, until, at 10 o'clock, we

halted to cook breakfast in the rolling prairie of Ross's Hole. During the day a number of citizens overtook us, and also two of our officers, who had a long stern chase after us from Fort Benton and Camp Baker. After a good rest and a hearty breakfast we pushed ahead again, and on approaching the Bitter Root River, struck once more the trail of the Indians, and passed through one of their camps.

The last doubt now in regard to their route is removed, and they are evidently going into the Big Hole Basin, over the identical route followed by Captain Clarke in 1807, for the trail keeps up the South Fork of the Bitter Root. They do not appear to have increased their speed at all, and we find but one dead horse on the road, shot evidently after he had broken down. Is it possible these Indians do not know we are on their track, or have they such a contempt for the small force of "Walk-a-heeps"<sup>1</sup> that they want to invite an attack? It is true the thickly wooded country is not favorable to long views, but a small rear guard would serve to give the main camp ample notice, and so far not an Indian has been seen.

Later, in the afternoon, having made only thirteen miles, we stop for the night near the head of a little valley and at the foot of the main divide of the Rocky Mountains, on ascending which, Blodget tells us, we will meet with a worse hill than any we have yet seen. Incredible as this appears, our incredulity is fully dispelled the next day.

In the mean time we form our bivouac, and Lieutenant Bradley, in charge of the advanced mounted party, comes to propose a night march for his command and an attempt to run off the Indian herd before daylight. Some twenty-five of the citizens who have joined us volunteer to accompany him, and at dark, with his force increased to about sixty men, all mounted, he leaves us and commences the ascent of the Rocky Mountains. The night proved very cold with a sharp frost. The command was astir early, got off a little after 5 o'clock, and soon commenced to ascend the slopes in front of us. The first ones, obstructed as they were with fallen timber, were bad enough, but we soon came to a part of the road which convinced us that Blodget had not been guilty of exaggeration in his description of it. The hill, almost 45° in inclination, could not be surmounted by winding round it in consequence of the masses of timber, both standing and fallen, and of adjacent precipices, and so had to be ascended direct. In addition to the other difficulties, the roadbed was formed of a mass of loose, shifting, rounded stones, upon which our poor animals could

---

<sup>1</sup> Indian name for infantry soldiers.



scarcely stand, much less pull. It was a "long road" to the top, and unfortunately had several "turns" in it, and these being very sharp ones, sadly interfered with the working of the long string of mules which we were obliged to attach to each wagon in turn. But the longest road must have an end, and so had this one, for in six hours after leaving camp, we reached the summit and commenced the long, gradual descent on the other side. This was not so difficult; yet it was by no means easy, for the timber, although smaller, stood much thicker on the ground, and a great deal had fallen across the road, which had to be removed before our wagons could pass. The road, too, was very crooked and in places marshy, so that it was a matter of wonder how our advance party could have gotten through at all in the darkness of the night. I received a dispatch from Lieutenant Bradley, before we reached the summit, informing me that the distance he had to pass over was greater than anticipated, and daylight had overtaken him before he had succeeded in reaching the Indian camp, and that he had concealed his party in the hills to await our arrival. Speed was now all the more important, as, should the Indians discover him, they might succeed in overwhelming his little party before we could join him.

Lewis and Clarke's *Journal*, under date of July 6th, 1807, says, "On reaching the other side, they came to Glade Creek, down which they proceeded, crossing it frequently into the glade on each side, where the timber was small and in many places destroyed by fire." This was precisely our experience now, except that having wagons instead of pack-mules, we were obliged to cross Glade Creek more frequently. As we proceeded, the crossings became more difficult, obscure and overgrown with brushwood, and here Blodget's services were inestimable to us. Riding ahead, he seemed to follow the obscure wagon-track by instinct, scarcely ever failed to hit at once the right crossing, and where that was washed out, to discover another. In this way we pushed ahead all day, not even stopping to rest or graze the mules, until our wagon-master came to complain that his mules were dropping in their harness, and his teams unable to go much farther. We then halted long enough to water and exchange the most wearied mules for some of the loose ones, and then resumed the march, for we had in the meantime passed another of the Indian camps, which showed us that the Indians had made another short march, and were as yet not alarmed. As our impatience to get forward increased, the difficulties of the route seemed to redouble. Again and again we recrossed the creek into the "glades" on each side, struggling through thick timber and in places swampy flats, in which our wagon-wheels sunk to the hub. Blodget informed us that we had one sharp, short hill to pull up, and after that would have but little

trouble. We had just reached the foot of this, and were preparing to double teams, when Bostwick, our Fort Shaw post-guide, rode up, and with a glow of excitement on his face, exclaimed, "We've got them, sir, we've got them!" at the same time handing me two bits of paper. One was from Lieutenant Bradley,<sup>1</sup> the other from Lieutenant Jacobs, who accompanied him, and both of the same import. The command was hid in the hills, within a short distance of the Indian camp, the herd of which had been seen, and by it the camp had been nearly located. It was thought the Indians had discovered the presence of the command, but that the camp might be surprised. Giving orders that the rear company (which happened to be Captain Logan's) should remain with the train, to help it up the hill, and push it along as fast as possible, I brought the remaining five companies to the front, and with the little mountain howitzer, hastened forward. But it was nearly sundown before we reached Lieutenant Bradley's position, near the mouth of the little valley down which we were travelling. Directly opposite the mouth, and projecting out into the open ground of the Big Hole Basin, was a high, bare hill, from the top of which a man could have looked directly up the valley, and have plainly seen every movement in it at the point where we stood, near which Lieutenant Bradley's party had been lying ever since early daylight. I was assured, however, that no Indians had been seen there, that the camp was supposed to be three or four miles distant down the stream to our left (east), and that it was resting in apparent security. Lieutenants Bradley and Jacobs having gone through the timber near enough to see a part of the animals grazing, to hear the sound of axes, and to hear the report of a rifle. It was now so late that it was not deemed best to move at once to the attack, but to wait for darkness to cover our march, and make the assault at daylight.

---

<sup>1</sup> As the last thing ever written by this officer, who was killed the next morning, this note is appended entire.

Aug. 8th, 1877.

BATTALION ADJUTANT.

SIR: I have the honor to report that I have personally seen the indications of an Indian camp situated in Big Hole, about three miles from my position. Lieutenant Jacobs accompanied me, and I have requested him to write a line in reference thereto. We saw horses grazing and mounted Indians, heard a gunshot, and the sound of axes. They evidently design staying all night, and from the anxious manner they have scouted the valley to the east, I judge that they have discovered a force in their front. They have seen my camp, but I do not expect them to attack me. Were the infantry to come up to-night we could attack them at daylight with great advantage, taking them in rear, as we have scouted the country well and found a safe and concealed route over the hills.

Very respectfully,

JAMES H. BRADLEY.

Marked, Received August 8th, 5.10 P.M.

The men were therefore permitted to rest, get something to eat, but without fires. The train was brought up, and just at dark closely parked in the bottom, the tired animals turned out to graze, and guards posted, to prevent them from straying. Additional ammunition was issued, so that each man should have ninety rounds, and all laid down to rest and wait for eleven o'clock, the hour designated for the movement to commence. I found that one of the citizens had preceded the column and been down to the mouth of the valley, from where he has seen some of the teepées, and he informed me of his ability to conduct us to the camp in the darkness.

It appeared to me so incredible that the Indians, knowing, as I supposed they necessarily must, we were on their track, should have no rearguard out or scouts to watch us, that I could not divest my mind of an apprehended "trap," and a fear, that whilst we were moving to surprise them we should ourselves be surprised. As may be imagined, therefore, not much of the time between dark and eleven o'clock was spent by me in sleep. To sleep, one's mind must be at rest, and mine was very far from it. We were obliged to leave a few men with the train, and I would gladly have taken our howitzer with us to add to the strength of the little command, but the trail was known to be rough and obstructed by timber, and the noise of removing this would in all probability betray us to the enemy. It was, therefore, decided to leave it behind, with orders to start to join us at the first break of day, bringing along a pack-mule loaded with two boxes of extra ammunition.

Promptly at eleven o'clock the command commenced its silent movement down the trail, all on foot except myself, Lieutenants Jacobs and Woodruff, and Bostwick, the Fort Shaw guide. Not one of these four horses got out of the battle with us alive. Lieutenant Bradley, with his party of soldiers, increased by thirty-four citizens, was placed in the advance, and arm in arm with the guide he moved off at the head of his party. The rest of us stumbled along after him in the dark, for I found it more satisfactory to walk than to ride. We tripped over the fallen timber, and now and then crossed streams and marshy places where we sunk over shoe-tops in mud. Once or twice a break occurred in the column, and the rear part got lost, so that the front had to halt, and finally to march at a snail's pace to enable the rear to keep up. The night, although bright starlight, was still so dark that objects could not be seen more than a few feet off. At length the trail began to improve, and skirting along the foot hills of an open valley we caught sight of a light glimmering in the distance. Strict silence was now enjoined upon all, and once or twice I moved to the front to counsel with and give instructions to Lieutenant Bradley. Light



after light now came in plain sight off in the valley to our right, and still with the apprehension of a trap before me I could scarcely hope we would not be discovered, and every moment expected to hear the crack of a rifle. Still we moved silently forward until, passing through a little belt of pine timber, which afterwards played an important part in our operations, we merged into the open beyond to find ourselves in the presence of a large herd of horses feeding on the hillside. As we approached the horses commenced to neigh, and the cry was taken up along the side-hill in a way which made me feel very uncomfortable. Fortunately, however, they did not become alarmed, and as we moved along the trail those nearest to us simply moved out of the way. The lights had now increased in number and the forms of the teepees could be indistinctly made out in the creek bottom below us. The dogs now commenced to bark, and as we halted abreast of the camp the cries of babies and the tone of conversation between the adults could be distinctly heard. The command now all laid down in the trail to rest and await the break of day, some of the men falling asleep. Those of us who did not do so had time to reflect upon our position, and this is the way it looked. Here we were, directly in the presence of, and undiscovered by, a band of hostile Indians. Their teepees, with their women and children, most of them asleep, were lying almost at our feet, whilst a large part of their herd, though by no means all of it, was on the opposite side of us. As soon as daylight came we would be discovered if we did not discover ourselves before, and then would come the conflict. Impressed with the importance of getting possession of the large herd which seemed to be almost within our grasp, I turned to Bostwick and directed him to take a few of the citizens, get round the herd and drive it back on our trail. He replied at once, "Why, General, there are probably a number of warriors around the herd guarding it." He was an old frontiersman, had lived for years amongst the Indians, and knew their habits well. His remark appeared to me so plausible, that impressed with the importance of not too soon creating an alarm I yielded at once to his suggestion. Almost immediately afterwards he said, "They have discovered us; don't you hear them?" I listened, and certainly there appeared to be more conversation and a stir in the camp; but this seemed to subside almost immediately, and we strained our ears to catch any new sound. "If they have not discovered us," said Bostwick now, "their fires will all die down, and just before daylight you will see the squaws begin to light them up again as it gets cold." A portion of the command, deployed as skirmishers, was now sent down into the bottom, and as a faint light appeared in the eastern horizon, a firebrand was seen to move from one

teepee to another in the camp from which now not a sound issued. The whole command except one company was now sent down into the willow-covered flat, and the word passed along to push forward to the village. As the light increased the features of the landscape came into view. At the foot of the bluff (some thirty or forty feet high), upon which we stood, commenced the flat of the creek bottom, covered except in spots with a thick growth of willows, in places almost impassable. This extended some two or three hundred yards across to Ruby Creek, a fine bold stream, in places waist deep. Between the foot of the bluffs and Ruby Creek extended up and down stream an old bed of the creek, now a stagnant slough filled with water and soft mud. On the opposite side of Ruby Creek was the Indian camp, extended out in a straggling open V along the bank of the creek. The line moved slowly forward, men and officers wading the slough and struggling through the brush as best they could. It was now getting so light that the whole outline of the camp could be made out, as well as the forms of our men as they moved forward. The camp was as still as death, and no sign of life was visible except the gradual increase of light in the camp-fires, where the squaws were evidently replenishing them.

Suddenly off on the left of the line a single rifle-shot broke on the still morning air, followed by another, and another, and then the whole line opened, and with a shout swept forward towards the teepees. The startled and completely surprised Indians rushed from the tents only to find themselves cut down by a withering fire from the brush, towards which some of them instinctively ran for shelter, whilst most of them scattered away from the fire out on the open prairie and up and down the creek. The last remaining company was sent in on the right at a run, and reached the upper end of the village just where the creek, making a bend towards us, afforded by its steeply-cut bank admirable shelter for the Indians, who, huddling together, opened a fire upon our men as they entered the village about its middle at the apex of the V. These were now taken in the rear, many of them slaughtered, and with loud shouts of triumph the whole command swept through the village. Many of the Indians still remained in the teepees, and some still alive and unwounded fired upon the men when tearing open the tents. One young officer narrowly escaped death at the hands of a squaw, who fired a pistol at him as he opened the door, and the next moment fell dead with a bullet through her brain. Some of the women and boys fought like the men, while others sought safety behind the creek-banks, crouching down with the water up to their waists. In crossing the stream near the upper end of the village I saw three of these poor wretches, one with a

baby in her arms, seated in the water behind a clump of bushes, and as I passed along one of them made me a salutation with her hand, as if to claim my protection. I tried to explain to her that she was safe, and beckoned her to come out, but none of them moved, and they remained there till we left the village.

Although we had complete possession of the village and had commenced to set fire to the teepees, the Indians had not by any means given up the fight, and we soon began to feel the effects of their long rifles and their superior marksmanship. But few of them remained in the brush near the village, but these few at every favorable opportunity sent a bullet whistling into our scattered disorganized ranks as the men ran from teepee to teepee setting them on fire, and shots soon came pouring into us from all directions. Depressions on the open prairie, points on the distant hills, and the trees and rocks on the trail we had just left, three and four hundred yards distant, were occupied by these unseen marksmen. The fire was not heavy, that is, was not very rapid and continuous, but at the crack of almost every one of those distant rifles some member of the command fell, and with this kind of fire we could not compete, for (it must be admitted), with very few exceptions, the command did not contain any such marksmen as these Nez Percés, drilled to the use of the rifle from childhood, showed themselves to be.

I noticed that as soon as the rifles commenced to crack, all the different herds of horses ran right together, bunched up like a flock of frightened sheep, and then moved off. The small herds in the valley were soon under control of the Indians, and immediately after we got possession of the village mounted men could be seen moving at full speed over the hills, some giving orders and others collecting the horses.

It soon became evident that losing men rapidly by the close fire of the Indians and unable to inflict any more harm upon them, it was necessary that we should occupy some position where we would be more on an equality with our foe. Orders were therefore given to leave the village and withdraw towards the bluffs we had started from. This was done, and as soon as the command reached the foot of the bluffs, and was protected from the fire coming from the high ground on that side, and hidden on the other side by the brush of the valley, it was pushed along towards the point of small pine timber which projected into the valley and through which we had passed the night before. This was already occupied by a few Indians, and these being driven out we took possession of the timber and disposed the men behind logs and other obstacles, prepared for a defence, which all knew we should soon be called on to make; nor were we permitted to wait long.

Just as we reached the timber, two shots from our little howitzer,



which it will be remembered was to follow us at the first break of day, were heard up the valley, and about a mile from us; of course we knew that this meant the death-knell of the little party with it, and as the Indians were thus shown to be between us and our inadequately protected train, the fear was a very natural one, that that too had, in Western phraseology, "gone up."

We had, however, but little time to speculate upon such subjects, or give much attention to any matters beyond the limits of our contracted horizon, for the Indians had now gathered about us, and from the timber above and the brush below, their rifle-shots began to seek out every exposed spot in our position. At first the men excitedly replied to every rifle-shot with a perfect shower of bullets, so that the Indians drew sometimes fifty bullets for one of their own, and every effort of the officers had to be exerted to restrain the firing, lest we should fall short of ammunition, and thus become an easy prey to a determined dash of the Indians. That they would make at least one such was confidently felt by all, and preparations were made to meet it. The men were distributed according to the needs of each point, and under the sharp fire which now assailed us, logs were placed in position and holes dug in the soft sandy soil with the invaluable Rice bayonet.

In the meantime, and whilst this fight was going on, a wail of grief came up from the Indian village as the extent of the damage we had done there became known, and the shrill cry of the squaws was mingled with the exhortation of the chiefs as they urged on their followers to wreak vengeance on us; one particular voice in the village could be distinctly heard by us haranguing the camp, and it seemed to have its effect upon the Indians who surrounded us, for when that paused an Indian in the timber above or the brush below us would shout out his commands, the others would respond with yells, and a shower of bullets would come whistling through the timber, cutting the limbs from over our heads and now and then striking some one less perfectly protected than the rest. These volleys, which at first caused almost every rifle of ours to go off in reply, were now received more coolly, and the men learned to watch for the smoke, and fire at that more deliberately and of course with greater effect. Finding too that the Indians showed no disposition to expose themselves unnecessarily in the open ground, and stuck to their trees and logs as closely as we did, all became more confident, and now very little ammunition was wasted in replying to these volleys.

The Indians, after loudly lamenting their dead, soon began to take down their teepees, and after packing up their things and collecting their horses the main body moved off over the hills to the southward. The fighting force, however, still remained around us, and as if watching the progress of the fight, small parties of mounted

Indians, evidently attending the chiefs, remained on the hills, whilst a large herd of horses made its appearance on a prominent hill to the eastward of us and remained there till late in the afternoon.

The long weary hours of the day wore on with more or less firing all the time, and even when there was a lull the slightest imprudence on the part of any one in exposing himself was sure to cause a shower of bullets. Our poor wounded were placed in the most sheltered position, and dragged through the long painful hours with such attendance as we were able to bestow upon them, for we were without a doctor, and such few medical supplies as we had were of course with the train.

The Indians, despairing of carrying our position by assault, now resorted to a stratagem, which strongly reminded us of one feature of the sham battle at Fort Shaw, mentioned in the forepart of this article. A strong breeze was blowing from the west, and from the grass which grew upon the hillside in that direction a wreath of smoke was seen to rise. This soon gathered in volume, and the fire commenced to sweep towards us over the hill, driven forward by the breeze. This was a new and dangerous foe, for although the grass about us was sparse and green, much of the timber was dead and dry, and should the fire reach any of the heaps of dead timber and brush near us, we would be smoked out of our position like rats in a hole, and the Indians would doubtless take advantage of our being blinded by the smoke, to make that dash upon us which every one had been anticipating ever since we reached the position. The progress of the fire was, therefore, contemplated with an anxiety which I suspect no one can feel unless staring grim death directly in the face, and as each new puff of smoke was wafted towards us it seemed to give us a foretaste of what we might have to suffer when, blinded by thick clonds of it, we might be called upon to meet a desperate charge of our foes. Every one nerved himself anew, and grasped his piece ready to act when the crisis came, and knowing that there was nothing to be done for any one except to die right there; for to retreat was out of the question. *There was no place to retreat to.* Slowly the fire struggled along through the thin grass, now dying away, now shooting up with fresh vigor as it reached some little pile of dry brush in its path, each fresh progress greeted with exultant yells by the hidden savages, and a sigh of relief escaped more than one of us when the wind slowly died out, and the fire on the side-hill followed its example.

The hostile demonstration now somewhat abated, but the slightest imprudence was sure to bring a reminder in the shape of bullets, to show us the enemy was still on the alert. As night closed in upon us, we came to the conclusion that the Indians would post-

pone their attack till morning, and after contracting our lines and making what additional dispositions we could to meet it, we prepared as best we could for a night's repose. Of course much rest was out of the question, for in addition to the fact that the Indians kept up their fire at intervals till a late hour, the night was very cold, we could build no fires and had no blankets. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks, and the knowledge of our peril, the officers had to keep constantly on the move amongst the exhausted men to keep them on the alert, and prevent them from going to sleep. The disciplined soldier, accustomed to look for orders from his officer, can, under such circumstances, throw off all responsibility from his mind and sleep soundly in the midst of danger. With the undisciplined it is different, and we soon became aware of this from the feeling developed amongst our civilian allies. During the night, whilst dozing, covered up in pine boughs, I became aware of a conversation going on between one of our officers and a citizen, and my attention was arrested by the officer saying he did not wish the citizen to express such sentiments as he had uttered in the presence of our men. I found on inquiry, that the man had been expressing the conviction that at daylight in the morning the Indians would make a desperate assault on us, and that we were all bound, in his expressive phraseology, "to go up." He was therefore in favor of taking advantage of the darkness to get away. I spoke very sharply to him, told him he was now by his own act under military control, that the command was going to remain where it was, and he must remain with it. Notwithstanding this he and a number of the other citizens stole out of camp under cover of the darkness and made their escape.

Before night closed in I engaged two of the citizens who knew the country, to start during the night and carry through dispatches to Deer Lodge, some ninety miles distant. They got off about midnight, travelled all the way to French's Gulch (forty miles) on foot, there borrowed horses, and took the first news of the battle to Deer Lodge. By them I sent an official dispatch to General Terry, and one to Governor Potts, asking for transportation, medical supplies, and doctors for our wounded. I wrote a similar request to be shown to anybody our couriers might meet, setting forth our wants, supposing that our train had been captured, and that we would be entirely dependent upon what the settlers could send us for food, and to get our wounded away from the field. These two last dispatches were taken to the telegraph office in Deer Lodge, and *both* dispatched as if directed to Governor Potts. This gave rise to the impression that they were not authentic, though some of the papers, in order to correct what they deemed an error, gave the



dispatches different dates, and represented one as written on the eighth day before the battle!

Shivering with cold, it was no difficult matter for us all to be alert at the first appearance of daylight, ready for the anticipated assault; but it did not come, and as the sun made its appearance in the eastern horizon and commenced to cast his warming rays upon us, we began to realize that our perils were probably over. At half-past six a citizen rode into our camp from the direction of the train, announcing himself as a courier from General Howard. He was asked if General Howard was on his way up, and a loud cheer burst from the men around me as he answered in the affirmative. He was then asked in regard to our train, but said he had seen nothing of it, and this confirmed the impression that it had been destroyed. On being cross-questioned, however, he admitted passing in the darkness a number of animals, which he took for Indian ponies, and that he might have passed the train without seeing it, which turned out to be the case. Half an hour afterwards another messenger from General Howard, a sergeant of cavalry, came in, and although his dispatch was previous to the one just received, his arrival relieved our minds in regard to the safety of our train, for he informed me that he had spent the night before at it, being unable to come to us the afternoon before on account of the Indians who were about us.

Scouts were now sent out and communicated with the train, but these encountered Indians, who again made their appearance around us, and a part of our force was sent out to bring the train to us. In the meantime we were without provisions, and now that the mental strain of anxiety was removed, empty stomachs began to assert their rights and cry aloud for food. The only one of our four horses brought out of the fight was wounded, and soon after we reached the timber he was killed by one of the shots fired at us. That night he was butchered, and before our train reached us the next day *horse-steaks* were voted very palatable.

After we had time to think over the incidents of the day, one was recalled which created a good deal of amusement. The second messenger who came to us, the cavalry sergeant, had a small piece of bread and a smaller piece of ham, which he very generously turned over to me. It is customary whenever men from another command reach a post to "*attach*" them to a company of the garrison for the purpose of drawing rations. The adjutant *says* that as soon as I got the sergeant's bread and ham I called to him and directed him "to attach the sergeant to a company for rations." He conducted the sergeant to where an unskinned, somewhat repulsive-looking *horse-leg* was lying in the dust, and said: "Sergeant,

here is the commissary, help yourself!" The sergeant replied he had been to breakfast and didn't feel hungry just then.

Our train reached us about sundown, and the camp was soon enlivened by brisk fires, around which the men gathered to recite the incidents of the fight, whilst the much-needed provisions were cooking, and for the first time we learned of the particulars of the struggle with the howitzer. In its attempt to join us, the men in charge of it were encountered by Indians, who opened fire upon them when it had reached within about a mile of us. Two of the men cowardly ran at the first fire, whilst the others loaded and fired the piece twice, and then, the horses being killed, used their rifles until, one of them being killed and two of the others wounded, the remainder succeeded in making their way back to the train under the guidance of Blodget, who was with them. They threw away the friction primers, so that the gun could not be fired, and then left it, together with over two thousand rounds of extra rifle ammunition, in possession of the enemy. We recovered the gun afterwards, but the Indians had taken off and carried away the wheels, implements, and shells, portions of which were afterwards found high up on the adjacent hills. That night late, after all but the guard were snugly wrapped in their blankets for a good night's rest, we received a parting volley from a distance, which had the effect of sending us hurriedly to our rifle-pits, but this proved to be the final farewell, and we saw no more of our foes.

Thus terminated the battle of the Big Hole, or as some of the papers got it, Big Hole *Pass*. It was fought on the open prairie, on the banks of Ruby Creek, a tributary of the Big Hole River, the "Wisdom River" of Lewis and Clarke. Our total loss was twenty-nine killed, including two officers, Captain Logan and Lieutenant Bradley, and forty wounded, including five officers, one of whom (Lieutenant English) afterwards died. The loss on the part of the Indians, was estimated at between eighty and ninety killed, most of those left on the field being buried, when we next visited the site of the village, on the 11th. On the morning of that day a party was sent over the field to bury our dead. All were recognized and buried where they fell. The number of Indian dead would have remained a matter of conjecture to us, but for the fact that the Indian scouts who came with the advance of the Oregon column, which reached our position that day, went upon the field, and with the triple purpose of recognition, scalping, and plunder, dug up the bodies. In this way the Indian loss in killed became known with tolerable accuracy.

A visit to the site of the village disclosed some facts of interest. The Indians evidently considered themselves safe from any imme-

diate pursuit. Many of their teepee poles, in place of being dry poles, collected for temporary use, as in all their previous camps, were green, carefully peeled, and bored at the end for permanent use. In addition to this, large quantities of the *Camas* root had been collected, and pits were found where it was being prepared for food. For this process, three days, we are told, are required, so that the Indians intended to occupy that camp at least that length of time. They evidently had not the slightest idea of being disturbed.

Whilst our burial parties were occupied on the field, on the morning of the 11th, General Howard, with a small escort, rode into our camp, and right glad were we to see him, for his arrival assured us of speedy medical assistance for our wounded. General Howard had pressed forward, ahead of his troops, with a few Indian scouts and mounted soldiers, supposing he was coming to the relief of a sorely pressed and starving party. He was, therefore, greatly surprised to find us out of all danger, and better off for food than he was. His medical officers reached us early the next morning (12th) and thoroughly examined and dressed all our wounded. To my surprise, they informed me that among all the wounded there was but one single case in which a doctor on the spot could have been of any material assistance. That was a man whose cheek had been laid open with a bullet, and had a doctor been present he could have sewed it up, and prevented an ugly scar. General Howard's cavalry got up in the afternoon, and as his supplies and infantry had not yet arrived, I turned over to him all the surplus provisions we had, and with his cavalry reinforced with fifty of my infantry, he the next day (13th) continued the pursuit of the Indians, now some twenty-five miles away, in the direction of Bannock, whilst the remainder of my force, the wounded loaded in wagons, and two of the worst cases on Indian "travois," constructed on the spot, moved out eastward over the rough prairie, towards Deer Lodge, some ninety miles away. The horrors of that march for those having wounds can not easily be imagined. With the exception of Lieutenant English and Sergeant Watson, who were the two carried on "travois" constructed in our camp, and both of whom afterwards died in Deer Lodge, all the wounded were carried in common baggage wagons without springs. For some distance there was no road, and our way lay over a rolling prairie, covered with bunch and buffalo grass and sage brush. As our wagons bounced over these, the effect on the wounded may be imagined, but cannot be described.

After we had proceeded about twelve or fifteen miles, our hearts were gladdened by the appearance of a great crowd of ambulances,



wagons, buggies, etc., loaded with all sorts of necessities and luxuries, which the good people of Deer Lodge, Butte and Helena had promptly started out to our relief. Our progress now towards the settlements was both more speedy and more comfortable, and our entrance into Deer Lodge, two days afterwards, will not soon be forgotten by any member of the little party. The whole town turned out and gave us a reception, and, best of all, the ladies of the place came forward and took complete charge of all the wounded, feeding and fostering them until the unwounded ones sighed at the absence of wounds, which would have entitled them to such attentions.

---

### VERNACULAR VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE, OLD AND NEW.

*The Holy Bible, According to the Authorized Version (A. D. 1611).* With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New Testament, Vol. I., St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1878. Royal 8vo.

IN a previous article it was shown, that it was the irreverent, impious intent of early heretics, in using Scripture for the support of their private judgment, to utterly overthrow God's Word, either by destroying its letter, or by perverting its spirit, as best happened to suit their purpose. As Tertullian says of the heretics of his time—"Alius manu Scripturas; alius sensus expositione intervertit" (De Præscript. cap. 38). That is to say, "This one boldly raises his hand (armed with the *knife*, *machæra*, as he says in parallel passages), against the Scripture; another, less bold and more cunning, uses gloss and commentary to pervert its sense." In other words, some lay violent hands upon God's Word, and cut out without scruple the book, chapter, or verse that conflicts with their private opinion; others adopt a seemingly milder but no less impious way, forcing the text by subtle exposition to coincide with the individual opinion or sectarian system they may have adopted.

To this latter plan belongs the artful pretext of translating, for

common use, the Sacred Books, from the original idiom into the languages of our day. The Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek of Scripture are all dead languages, that ceased to be spoken centuries before modern heresy arose. They are in the truest sense of the word, "unknown tongues" for the unlearned, who form the greatest portion of the class which claims an "open Bible" as its birthright; as inaccessible to them as to the great bulk of Catholics, who content themselves with reading the "dead letter" in due subordination to the Living Voice.

In days of old, especially whilst the original language of the New Testament was alive and current among the Christian people, there was little room for attempting by this process to deceive the unwary reader. But even before the birth of Christianity, Hebrew, the original language of the Old Testament, had died out as a spoken tongue. And it was on this, alone that heresy could try her "prentice hand." True to her instincts she did so. But from the nature of things, as there were no printing facilities in that day, this could not frequently happen. The only instances we find were those of Ebionites or Judaizing Christians, to whom the version of the Seventy seemed too favorable to certain doctrines of Christianity, from which their private judgment dissented. Those of them whose versions have survived, but only in a fragmentary state, are Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus.

Their object in translating was twofold. In the first place, to break down the authority of the Septuagint, which was quoted as authority by the Christians in their controversies with the Jews. The better to effect this, Aquila translated with extreme literal rigor, in order that the difference between the original Hebrew and the quotations (according to the version of the LXX.) alleged from it in the Greek New Testament, might the more forcibly strike any common reader and inspire him with distrust of the good faith of the Seventy Interpreters. But their most important point was to weaken by studied mistranslation the force of the prophetic passages of the Old Testament, which foretold the coming of our Lord in the flesh, His wonderful Incarnation, His Atonement, and His Godhead. Thus Aquila's renderings of Gen. i. 1, 5, and elsewhere, in which the Hebrew idiom is carried bodily into Greek, in utter defiance of grammar and sense, were only a blind. They were remote approaches intended to win the confidence of the incautious reader, and thus lead him to swallow in the end such wicked perversions as that of Isaias vii. 14, where the Hebrew word *Alma* is translated *νεανίς* (girl, or young woman), and not, as has been properly rendered by the LXX., *παρθένος* (virgin). Thus all the significance of that noble prophecy, "Lo! a virgin shall conceive and bear a son," is lost, and one of the leading articles of

Christian faith is slyly undermined. The word "virgin" is found in all versions, ancient and modern, Catholic and non-Catholic, and is sanctioned by the New Testament, which alleges the prophecy for that very reason.

It might be reasonably expected that no one bearing the name of Christian could fail to resent with just indignation, or at least to qualify by its proper name, this impious mistranslation, so injurious to the Gospel, to Christ our Lord, and to the Holy Ghost, who inspired Isaias. Not so. An Anglican divine,<sup>1</sup> who enjoys, and deservedly, the name of a great Biblical scholar, has his kind word to interpose on behalf of Aquila. He does it cautiously, but the writer's meaning cannot be mistaken. After admitting what cannot be denied, that "it is sufficiently attested that this (Aquila's) version was formed for controversial purposes" (a very mild way, indeed, of stating the case!) he adds the charitable suggestion, that after all, "these renderings were perhaps rather modes of avoiding an argument than direct falsification." It is, it would seem, quite a lucky thing for a man's fame with posterity, when he has come down for the first fifteen centuries in ill-repute with Christ's Church and all her children. This, no matter what his character or deeds, appears to be his best passport to sympathy and excuse at the hands of the non-Catholic world. If one of our illustrious saints had been charged, justly or unjustly, with misdeed or foible, we fear the moral perceptions of our divine would have been thoroughly roused, and he would have lashed it with unsparing rigor. But his heart (he cannot help it, for it is in the nature of things), warms to the Ebionite, and he comes forward with his kindly word of apology. Is it, we venture to ask, allowable or honest to frame versions of Scripture on a controversial basis? Or is it possible for poor human nature to set about the task of translating God's Word "for controversial purposes," and not transfuse into the Sacred Text human controversy and commentary, while pretending to give the reader God's pure, unadulterated Revelation? One word, at times, skilfully added or altered, is quite sufficient to settle a controversy *in the text*, without having recourse to notes. And to do this in order "to avoid an argument" is no excuse, no palliation, but an aggravation of the offence. If the argument be really in the text, to elude it by mistranslation is not only to suppress what is true, but to convey what is false. And the excuse, that this wanton, wicked tampering with the oracles of the Holy Ghost is not "direct falsification," may commend itself to some as a clever

<sup>1</sup> Dr. S. P. Tregelles. His apology for Aquila acquires a peculiar significance, when it is remembered that he was chosen as one of the Board for the revision of the Anglican version. Would he be likely to be *very* severe on its "controversial purposes," and its "modes of avoiding an argument," contained in the original?



point of fine-spun casuistry, but for the true Christian it can mean but one thing, betrayal of God's revealed Word to its enemies.

But, to come back from this digression, were there in the early Church no translations made into other tongues for the benefit of the converted nations that did not understand Greek and Hebrew? Unquestionably; and amongst them the most deserving of mention are the Latin and the Syriac. It was a matter of necessity; because the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, the Liturgy, and Divine Office were made up in great part of the writings of the Old and New Testament. And the Church never would have allowed her ministers to represent Christ at the altar, or to administer His sacraments in a tongue unknown to them. The Holy Books were, therefore, translated, but by faithful men under the auspices of the Church, and with her approbation. The work was undertaken, not by private whim, nor with heretical intent to color and pervert God's Word by mistranslation for sectarian or "controversial purposes." If any one, even from not unworthy motives of private devotion, undertook the task, his work met a suitable fate, and soon faded away into oblivion. Of the many Latin versions that were thus made, as we learn from St. Augustine, not one has survived to our day.

It is not, however, of such men that we wish to speak. Whether moved to translate by the voice of authority, or by the mere prompting of private devotion, they always acted in good faith. Some of them may have erred occasionally from ignorance, but it was involuntary on their part. They would have shuddered at the thought of deliberately falsifying God's Word. We speak of those others who sat down ostensibly to *translate*, but really intending to *mistranslate*, in order to obtain some show of divine authority for their own errors or those of their sect. It was not that they wished to circulate God's revealed Word and saving Truth amongst the people. This was the pretext. What they really meant was, what heresy even now means, under cover of His Word to circulate their own human word, their novelties and false doctrines. But the number of such translators in early times was necessarily limited. The only dead language which could serve their purpose, was the Hebrew, and those who acquired a theoretical knowledge of its remains were very few. Hence mistranslation was of necessity confined to Palestine or its neighborhood, and, as we have seen, was attempted only by Judaizing Christians.

Subsequently, when, besides Hebrew and Greek, even Latin had become a dead language throughout Europe, and was no longer understood, save by a few scholars, there grew up an increased necessity for translation, unless the reading of the Scriptures was to be confined to the learned few. But the Church has never in-

sisted that the perusal of Scripture should be the privilege of the few, however learned. She does not impose on her children any obligation of reading the inspired Volume, for she was taught otherwise by Christ her Founder and His apostles. Nor does she allow them to "search the Scriptures," that is, to determine its meaning by the standard of private interpretation. She, who received her commission to teach, and fulfilled it long before a line of the New Testament was written, remembers well that it was written for no such purpose. But she is willing and anxious that all her children should enjoy the benefit of reading those Holy Books, provided they be read according to the spirit in which they were dictated by the Holy Ghost, and written out under His inspiration. They were not given us as problems for our investigation, but as lessons for our correction and our edification. So St. Paul tells us of all Scripture, and especially of his own Epistles. "*Hæc autem omnia . . . scripta sunt ad correptionem vestram.*" "*In Christo loquimur : omnia autem propter ædificationem vestram.*"<sup>2</sup>

It was not, however, to be expected that, during the Middle Ages, translations into the vernacular should be abundant; for, in the first place, during a long period of that time the troubled condition of Europe checked the diffusion of anything like general culture. Yet, in spite of all difficulties, the Church did what she could under the circumstances to spread mere human learning among the people. And what she did, considering the obstacles she had to encounter, was something truly wonderful. The European nations owe to her efforts that they ever emerged from barbarism. But in every time her principal care was to provide a Christian education for all classes, high and low, learned and unlearned. And after all, whatever the Pagan world of to-day may think, this is man's *summum bonum*, by the side of which all else that he may acquire of worldly lore shrinks almost into nothing. And a great part of that education, to the horror of modern ears be it said, consisted in making them acquainted with the Bible. Only a few could read its pages in manuscript, but she contrived to set it before the eyes of the multitude. The paintings—those books of the illiterate—with which she lavishly adorned her temples and sanctuaries, were chiefly devoted to Bible history. It was

<sup>1</sup> Nothing could be more absurd than to suppose this command (if such it were, which it is not) addressed to Christians. If any one will read it in the Evangelist's context, he will readily discover that it is only a rebuke administered to the wicked Scribes and Pharisees, who "persecuted and sought to slay" (John v. 16) our Blessed Lord. It would be hard for any Christian to admit this character in himself, or in the Church to which he belonged.

<sup>2</sup> "Now all these things . . . are written for our correction" (I. Cor. x. 11). "We speak before God in Christ; but all things, my dearly beloved, for your edification" (II. Cor. xii. 19).

in these holy places that old and young loved to congregate and spend their leisure hours on Sunday and festivals—not in the gin-shop and beer-garden, or on rifle-club excursions, or locked in and carousing privately for fear of Judaizing elders, as their descendants do now in England, Germany, Switzerland,<sup>1</sup> and Scotland. The priest or schoolmaster pointed out the figures in the picture, and explained the history of each to the attentive, delighted crowd. Parents rehearsed the story to their children at home. And thus there was diffused through the generations of men a traditional knowledge of all the great personages of the Bible from Genesis down to the Apocalypse. It would not be rash to assert that some of those illiterate mediæval Christians, on whom we look down with such contempt, would not only compare favorably with many amongst us in a knowledge of Bible history, but would put to shame not a few of those who profess to read the Bible and do not, aye many of our Catholics, who have received what is called a fine education, and whose only way of showing it is by their steadfast devotion to lying newspapers, frivolous magazines, and trashy novels, which are half the time immoral and unchristian.<sup>2</sup>

As we have already remarked, during a long period of the Middle Ages a lack of general education, arising from the nature of the times, was of itself sufficient to account for the fewness of translations. Another special reason, growing out of this general one, was the rude, imperfect condition of the vernacular tongues which the new peoples had imported into Europe, or which had grown up on its soil after Latin had ceased to be spoken. These tongues had grammars of their own, unwritten grammars, if you will, but rich in inherent powers of development and perfectibility, as time has shown. But they had not been as yet developed. Besides, it must be remembered, that to the small but imperceptibly growing crowd of those who, thanks to the fostering care of the Church, to a solid Christian training united the knowledge of letters and science, a translation was unnecessary, for all culture at that day presupposed the knowledge of the Latin language. And the Vulgate of St. Jerome amply supplied the wants of every reader of the Bible. Yet even then there appeared not a few versions in the vernacular, total or partial, of the book of Scripture. Thus in those very countries where even children are now taught that their

---

<sup>1</sup> See Laing's "Notes of a Traveller," where he speaks of how the Sunday is kept in Calvin's home, Geneva. The author is a Scotch Presbyterian, and his honesty and truthfulness are so evident, that even a Catholic reader must feel disposed to pardon his occasional outbursts of Scotch Calvinism.

<sup>2</sup> Nor should we overlook the moral effects of such pictures. They were perpetual admonitions, sermons speaking to the heart of each beholder. "The painter," says St. Basil, "does by his art what the preacher does by his eloquence."—(Homily on the Forty Martyrs, inter Opp. Basilii, Ed. Garnier. Paris: 1722, tom. ii., p. 179.)



Christian forefathers were buried in damnable idolatry for over eight hundred years,<sup>1</sup> there were not wanting during that same period zealous Bible students, who did their best to promote the reading of God's Word, by translating it into the vernacular for the benefit of laymen who could read.

In proof of this we need only refer to the labors of Venerable Bede, Aldhelm, and Aelfric, and to the Durham Book (of Gospels), in England; and to Notker's<sup>2</sup> Psalter, and William<sup>3</sup> of Bamberg's

<sup>1</sup> "So . . . not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise, not the people only but the bishops, not the sheep but also the shepherds themselves . . . being blinded by the bewitching of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry. In the which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age, by the space of above eight hundred years." And again on the same page, "So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children OF WHOLE CHRISTENDOM (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more." Certain sermons or homilies appointed to be read in churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory, and now thought fit to be reprinted by authority from the King's Most Excellent Majesty (the "merry monarch" Charles II., who made his peace with God by embracing this "idolatry" on his death-bed). Oxford, 1683, p. 150.

That this assertion, as impious as it is extravagant, should have escaped the lips of some furious bigot in the heat of angry controversy, would not be so very surprising; but that a Church, calling itself Christian, should give it her deliberate sanction and insert it in her liturgy, where it remains till this day, is something so outrageous that words fail with which properly to characterize it. Instead of hurting the Catholic Church, it is her own condemnation, for it proves how little she has in common with the meek "Dove," prefigured symbol of the heavenly spouse and true Church of Christ.

It would be interesting to have the date assigned whence we are to count back this dark millennium of idolatry. Was it when Luther first rebelled in 1517? Or when the light of the new "Gospel" first flashed from Anne Boleyn's eyes in 1526? Or when the Church of England was thoroughly Calvinized under Edward VI.? Or must we go back to the days of the "first reformer," Wickliffe, about 1350? This will carry us back near the days of St. Jerome, to whom chiefly, under God and His Church, Europe owes it that she had the Bible during those centuries.

<sup>2</sup> See Notker's "*Psalmen nach der Wiener Handschrift herausgegeben von Richard Heinzel und Wilhelm Scherer, Strasburg, 1876.*" This precious monument of Old German literature had been previously published according to the St. Gall MS., in Schilter's *Thesaurus* (Ulm, 1726), with the notes of Father Francke, Librarian of the Monastery of St. Gall. The author was known as Notker Labeo, to distinguish him from two or rather three other Notkers, all illustrious men in their day; Notker, Bishop of Liege, Notker Physicus, and Notker Balbulus, author of the famous sequence, "*Media vita*" ("In the midst of life we are in death").

<sup>3</sup> The Preface or "Prologus" alone, of William (Guilleramus, or Willeram), of Bamberg, was published by Martene & Durand in their "*Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Amplissima Collectio.*" Tom. I., p. 508. In a note the editors give the first few lines in Latin and German, and no more, as they say the work had been already published with the Works of Hildebert, by the Maurine Father Beaugendre, in 1708, who had, however, falsely attributed it to Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes, in Bretagne—a strange mistake, but repeated after Beaugendre by many writers. What is yet stranger, neither Martene nor Beaugendre seem to have known the original edition of

Canticle of Canticles in Germany. Notker's version grew immediately into great favor with those who could read only the vernacular; and an old writer<sup>1</sup> who came soon after, calls it "Psalterium, in quo omnes, qui *barbaricam*<sup>2</sup> legere sciunt, multum delectantur." He adds that the Empress Kisila (so he calls Gisela, wife of Conrad II., and mother of Henry III.) was very fond of reading Notker's works, and engaged the monks of St. Gall to transcribe for her own use a copy of his Psalter and his Job. "Kisila imperatrix, operum ejus avidissima, psalterium ipsum et Job sibi exemplari<sup>3</sup> sollicitè fecit."<sup>4</sup> The translation of Job here alluded to is no longer in existence. The Canticle of William of Bamberg was paraphrased by him in Latin elegiacs, as well as translated into Teutonic prose. His poetry, considering the age when he wrote, is remarkably good. As to the matter, his theological and exegetical skill was not only extolled in his day, but has excited the admiration of learned Protestants.<sup>5</sup>

Such versions, though few compared to our times of printing, were more numerous and more popular in the Middle Ages than many nowadays are willing to acknowledge, some through religious jealousy, others (even Catholics) through supercilious contempt of what their pride (or their ignorance rather) has taught them to look upon as a period of universal darkness. When, however, we recall the fact that the sovereigns<sup>6</sup> and courts of Germany and England (the great Alfred was not only a patron of such versions, but a translator himself), it is natural to conclude that studies of the kind must not only have prevailed among

---

William's "Canticle," published at Hagenau, in 1528, by Molterus. See "Willeram, Abbatis in Cantica Salomonis Mystica Explanatio per Menradum Moltherum in lucem restituta. Hagenoae (G. Geltz), 1528. 12mo."

<sup>1</sup> In Pertz's Collection, II. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Barbarous* here means simply the language of the common people, as opposed to the Latin, which was the language of the schools: To give a sample of the radical identity of Notker's German with that of to-day, we subjoin his version of the first verse of the first Psalm: "Der man ist salig der in dero argon rat ne gienc (Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum), noh an dero suntigen vvege ne stuont (et in via peccatorum non stetit), noh an demo suhtstuole ne saz (et in cathedra pestilentie non sedit)." There is no other language of Western Europe that can produce a document written a thousand years ago, which comes so near its present form of speech.

<sup>3</sup> "Exemplo, as (to copy) a mediæval word of frequent use. It dates back as far at least as Ruricius, Bishop of Limoges, in the fifth century. It was used also by St. Augustine, but in another sense: 'to make an example of,' *i.e.*, 'ludibrio palam exponere.'"

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Heinzel's *Vorgeschichte* prefixed to the edition of 1876, p. xlvii.

<sup>5</sup> See the high encomium on his paraphrase by the erudite scholar Junius, quoted by Cave in his *Historia Literaria*, art. *Willeramus*.

<sup>6</sup> A Teutonic version of the Scriptures was also made by order of Charlemagne.

courtiers, but must have spread to a wider circle of readers. This lesson is taught by the history of every age.

Componitur orbis  
Regis ad exemplum.<sup>1</sup>

And no doubt, where there are many readers, there must have been a suitable provision of writers, translators and paraphrasts to supply proportionately the demands of mediæval Bible-readers. And as in most cases, if not all exclusively, these writers were monks or ecclesiastics of some kind, it is clear that the Church, instead of forbidding or discouraging, rather countenanced and promoted Bible-reading in the Middle Ages.

As long as Christians read and studied the Scriptures in the true, proper spirit, as pious Jews of old read the Law and the Prophets, with the aim and intent of admiring God's wisdom, of listening obediently to His voice, and making of His words a help to holiness of life, the Church never dreamt of "chaining the Bible" (as the stereotyped lying phrase has it), or preventing her children from its perusal. But when those men rose up, of whom prophetic Scripture had given warning, who<sup>2</sup> would not hear Christ or His Church, but despised Him and His Heavenly Father in their duly commissioned representatives (to use His own words<sup>3</sup>), who lifted themselves up above Scripture and subjected it to their own rule and caprice, as if it were not God's Word, but their own, and made of it not only their property but

<sup>1</sup> Claudian.

<sup>2</sup> In the last days there shall come scoffers, with deceit walking according to their own lusts. . . . Who walk after the flesh . . . and despise government, audacious, pleasing themselves, they fear not to bring in sects, blaspheming. . . . As irrational beasts, naturally tending to the snare and to destruction, blaspheming those things which they know not. . . . Forsaking the right way, they have gone astray. . . . Fountains without water and clouds tossed with whirlwinds. . . . Speaking swelling words of vanity, they allure in desires of the flesh of riotousness those who had escaped . . . promising them liberty, when they themselves are slaves of corruption. . . . Who defile the flesh, and despise dominion, and blaspheme majesty. . . . Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion, wandering stars. . . . Murmurers, full of complaints, walking according to their own desires, and their mouth speaking proud things, . . . mockers, walking according to their own desires in impieties, . . . who separate themselves, sensual men, not having the spirit. . . . Men who wrest (not only St. Paul's Epistles, but also the other) Scriptures to their own perdition (2 Peter ii. 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19; iii. 3, 16; Jude 8, 13, 16, 18, 19). Could there be a more lively picture of Luther and his rabble rout of sensual friars, rushing from their convents, not only "to walk after the FLESH," but to mock the Christian people by proclaiming it (the freedom of the flesh) from the pulpit as the perfection of Gospel liberty—speaking swelling words of pride against the Catholic Church, and blaspheming her doctrines and mysteries, of which they understood nothing—and finally perverting Paul, John, and Matthew (as they irreverently called them) to the eternal ruin of their own souls, and those of their unwary hearers.

<sup>3</sup> Luke x. 16.



their plaything, altering (as it happened to suit them) not only the meaning but the very text of the Divine Message—then, and only then, did the Church interfere. Reverence for God's Word, which they so shamefully misused, and zeal for the welfare of the souls intrusted to her care, pointed out the course she had to take; and had she not discharged her responsibility by taking it, she would have been inexcusable before God and man. Accordingly she forbade the circulation and reading of all Bibles translated by heretics, that is, those who "had separated themselves and brought in sects," and allowed only those which had been made by approved interpreters, and were furnished with orthodox notes to explain doubtful passages, or such as were most liable to be misunderstood by ordinary readers. Such was the legislation of the great Council of Trent. In purely Catholic countries, where they are no longer needed, some other formalities attached to this general law yet remain in force. But, strange to say, in mixed countries, where they would seem to be more needed, they have become obsolete. At all events, Catholics may thank heresy, and not the Church, for any restrictions laid on their reading the Bible in the vernacular.

But it may be urged, if there were, at least proportionately to the times, many vernacular versions in the Middle Ages, what has become of them? How is it that so few have survived? The true answer may perhaps (it certainly ought to) bring a blush to the cheek of those who are in the habit of putting such questions. In the first place it must be said that most of these books, like a thousand other precious remains of classical and mediæval literature, were wickedly and wantonly destroyed. Destroyed? And by whom? Not by the monks, surely. Who could imagine, for example, that the monks of St. Gall would knowingly make away with the German Job of their confrere Notker, of which not a fragment has come down to us. Was it, then, the work of Bishops or Inquisitors who ransacked church archives and monastic libraries in search of Bibles, to consign them to the flames? It is not likely; and no one has dared assert it, not even such unscrupulous romancers, or enemies of truth rather, as Fox and D'Aubigné. And even had they set out in quest of Bibles to burn, they would have singled them out, and not destroyed indiscriminately with them missals, breviaries, Prayer-books, Lives of the Saints, Holy Fathers, etc. Who then, were the true culprits? The answer is plain. It was the Vandalic hordes of the Reformation, who desecrated the Catholic shrines and churches, pillaged and burnt the archives and libraries of cathedrals and monasteries in Germany, the Low Countries, and Switzerland, and France, in the fury of their reforming zeal. They were filled with the spirit and acted on the principle of the Mohammedan Omar when he burnt the libraries of Christian Alex-

andria, in which were hoarded up the priceless treasures, never to be regained, of the old classical world. They verified to the letter the saying of Erasmus, that the pretended Reformation of religion was only another name for the destruction of all literature.<sup>1</sup> Lutheranism, as he judged it simply by its results, was synonymous with "interitus literarum," the ruin of literature. A mere memorandum (of transfer of ownership for example) in one of these MSS., if accompanied by the sign of the Cross, as was usual in such documents, was enough to consign it to the flames or to mutilation. How will our non-Catholic friends account for and explain in a logical way, that will be satisfactory to their conscience, this unearthly hatred of the sign of the Cross, the Cross which was our redemption, as St. Paul tells us? Catholics need no information nor explanation on the subject, for they have been taught by Scripture, and by a thousand examples in Church history, that the Devil hates and fears the sign of the Cross, which dispossessed him of the empire he once held over this world, and is only too glad to avail himself of human agency in insulting and persecuting it. It is only the Church of Christ and her arch-enemy who understand what the Cross truly means. For both of them it is the

Arbor decora et fulgida,  
Ornata Regis purpura,  
    . . . . .cujus brachiis  
Pretium pendit sæculi,  
Statera facta corporis  
Tulitque prædam Tartari.<sup>2</sup>

But this knowledge excites in them very different emotions. In her it awakens love and undying reverence; in him it produces hatred and a desire of revenge. And, what is most deplorable, he finds in so-called Christians, outside of the Catholic Church, willing tools to aid him in his work of hatred and revenge.

It is probably to those reforming vandals that we owe the loss of the works of Ennius and Varro, Cicero's treatises *de Consolatione* and *de Gloria*, the missing Decades of Livy, and a hundred other treasures of untold worth that have hopelessly perished through their wicked hands. Many of these were known to exist some years before the Reformation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Ubi regnat Lutheranismus, ibi est literarum interitus." "The prevalence of Lutheranism brings with it the destruction of all literature."

<sup>2</sup> Processional Hymn of Venantius Fortunatus used by the Church in her office of Passiontide.

<sup>3</sup> Hugh S. Legaré, in an article written some fifty years ago in the "Southern Review," and republished in his works (Charleston, 1845, vol. ii. p. 226), speaking of palimpsests or *codices rescripti*, says, "Who shall balance the account between what was saved by the liberal and what was destroyed by the ignorant or bigoted zealot,

The devastation wrought in libraries on the Continent of Europe was generally the work of ruffians, whose hands were armed, who were flushed with military as well as religious excitement, drunk with victory which had been purchased by their blood. And this, though it cannot justify, may extenuate in some way, or at least explain their wicked deeds. But in England it was *organized* vandalism, deliberately set on foot by civil tribunals and legal commissions. Let any one read Anthony Wood's account of their doings, when they visited Oxford and its colleges. Any manuscript that had on it a cross or other religious emblem was torn to pieces, and the fragments scattered to the winds. Many books of mathematics were treated in the same way, because the figures were supposed to be "Popish" emblems of devotion. The rest were carted away and sold for waste paper. The monastery of Malmesbury had a collection of MSS., perhaps the finest in England. The house was ravaged and plundered of all its contents by Henry's minions, or commissioners so called, and not one was left. Years after, an antiquary who travelled through the town of Malmesbury, relates that he saw broken windows patched up with remnants of the most valuable MSS. on vellum, and that the bakers had not even then consumed the stores they had accumulated, in heating their ovens.<sup>1</sup> From Merton College alone an immense quantity, almost a wagon-load of MSS. was carried off. Here is the testimony of an eye-witness. Some MSS. they sold "to grocers and soapsellers, and some they sent over the sea to the bookbinders, not in small number, but at times whole ships full. Yea, the universities of

between the copies made and the MSS. effaced by monks and priests? At all events, a general search-warrant ought to go forth against every inch of parchment occupied by the Gregorys and the Ambroses, the Jeromes and the Chrysostoms. There is probable cause enough for this grand *conceptio furti*." It would be more to the point to issue a writ, summoning into the court of this nineteenth century the ghosts of those religious Goths and Vandals, who, in the name of Protestantism, ransacked, pillaged and burnt the libraries of Europe three hundred years ago. But even could they be made to appear, we should be none the wiser. They could be made to confess that they had destroyed and burnt, but *what* they destroyed and burnt they could never tell. Possibly the very works of Varro, the Origines of Cato, the lost poems of Menander and Alcæus, to which Mr. Legaré subsequently refers. The monk's palimpsest was in itself no crime against the republic of letters. If he effaced a Pagan MS. it was only with the view of replacing it by what he considered more useful. He may have been mistaken, but an error of judgment (granting it to be such) is no crime. For the Reformers' wanton barbarism there can be no excuse. But Mr. Legaré, though a learned man in other respects, knew little of the history of Protestant vandalism. Indeed, it has yet to be written. And it would be a subject worthy the attention of a good scholar.

Mr. Legaré was a good and great man, a classical scholar of the highest attainments, and a writer of no ordinary power. But, unfortunately for his reputation, he was born outside of New England, and, therefore, the American public knows little or nothing about him.

<sup>1</sup> Maitland's Dark Ages. London, 1853, p. 281.



this realm are not all clear of this detestable fact. I know a merchantman that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings. This stuff he has used instead of gray paper for more than ten years, and he has enough for ten years to come."<sup>1</sup>

But this vandalism, it will be said, and Dr. Cunningham Geikie is bold enough to say it, was not the work of the Reformers. Not the work of their hands, it may be, but of their wicked tongues. They encouraged it and put a premium on it. Here is a case in point, and from their own official records. In the "Fourth National Synod of the Reformed Churches of France, held at Lyons, on the 10th of August, 1563, third year of the reign of Charles IX., King of France, M. Pierre Viret, pastor of the church at Lyons, being moderator," among other things that came up for discussion and decision, was the case of an apostate Abbot (*qui etait parvenu a la conoissance d l'evangile*, in plain English, who had learned to appreciate the new gospel and its liberty of the flesh), who applied for admission to the Lord's Supper. Some doubts of his orthodoxy having been suggested, evidence was brought that he had pulled down the idols (pictures) of his church, forbidden the chanting of mass in his convent, *burnt its records*, and borne arms in defence of the Gospel. On hearing this, every doubt as to his thorough Calvinism vanished, and he was admitted to the Lord's Supper. The summary of this fact, as given in the Index to the Synod, is so quaint and expressive, that it is worth transcribing:

"Abbe recu a la cene *pour avoir brule ses titres*, abatu les images (in the acts of Synod, they are called *les idoles*), de l'eglise de son convent, et porte les armes pour maintenir les predicateurs Reformes."<sup>2</sup>

To come back to our main point, mistranslation of the Bible was never known in the Christian Church, save in the case of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, down to the days of modern heresy

<sup>1</sup> Bale, as quoted by Rev. Cunningham Geikie, in the "English Reformation." New York, 1879, p. 343. Bale (Balæus) was a renegade Carthusian friar, a "monstrum Carthusianum," as Luther styled one of the same cloth, the court-parson of Hesse, by whose evangelical exhortations Margarite von der Sale was seduced into the belief that she ought to become the *additional* wife of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse. Bale's polemical works are a thorough sink of lewd, filthy ribaldry, which disclose the true character of the early English Puritans. His writings, as far as they are historical, are a mass of unparalleled mendacity. The Protestant Wharton says of him, that he is so unscrupulous a "liar" that no statement can be taken on his unsupported testimony. But Bale always lied for a purpose, and in the interest of his sect. When it is otherwise his testimony may be relied on. In the present case he is a good witness against his own crew.

<sup>2</sup> Abbott N. N. admitted to the Lord's Supper, "*because he had burnt his (abbey) records, pulled down the pictures of his convent church, and borne arms in support of the reformed Preachers.*" Aymon, apud Maitland, Dark Ages, p. 500.

We speak not of faulty translation, which may spring from error or incompetency, and which may consist with innocence. We speak of mistranslation in its strict literal and moral sense, a false rendering that originates in malice, and cannot be conceived, unless accompanied by deliberate deadly sin. And what is malice? Cicero's definition is quite to the purpose. It is "the doing of wrong (or harm) with cunning and deceit."<sup>1</sup> The Reformers, in their translations, were guilty of all this. Their "cunning" was shown by their pretext of having recourse to the original texts in order to give the world a purer and better version than the Catholic Vulgate. The "deceit" consisted in altering and falsifying the sense of those originals under cover of translation. Of the *objective* harm they wrought, it is useless to speak. No human calculation can reach it; nor will its depths ever be fully sounded until the great Judgment day. We speak now of harm as Cicero does, *subjectively*, that is, as far as the doing of harm lay in their mind and intention. They certainly *meant to injure* their disciples and followers, for their deliberate purpose was to delude them, to lead them into error, error that affects the eternal interests, for weal or woe, of redeemed souls. Their intention, further, was to injure the Catholic Church and her divinely established teaching ministry, by representing her doctrine as unscriptural, by artfully excluding it from the text when found there, or by adroitly foisting their own opinions into the text, which originally, as it came from the mouth of inspiration, did not contain them. We see in them, therefore, every feature of that *versuta et fallax nocendi ratio*, which constitutes malice. With all of them this *malice* was a matter of habitual practice; with some of them, as we shall see, it was elevated to the rank of a principle.

As Luther was the great standard-bearer of religious revolt against Church authority, so he was also the father and founder of the school of mistranslation. We give a few specimens of the arbitrary way in which he dealt with the text, when it ran counter to his heretical notions. When he was a Catholic, he believed that penance was a sacrament, and had three essential parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, or, as it is technically called, "penance." After leaving the Church, he retained the two former, after a fashion, but discarded the third. Accordingly he determined to put it out of the Bible, as well as out of his creed. Hence, in Matthew iii., 2, he disfigures the exhortation of the Baptist, rendering the word μετανοείτε (*do penance* or *repent*), by the German words, "bessert euchr" (*mend* or *do better*). Now, the context is directly against this translation, for it shows that penance is not simply a

<sup>1</sup> "Est enim malitia versuta et fallax nocendi ratio." Cic. de Nature Deorum, lib. iii. § 30.

state of mind (though Luther and his Puritan followers seem to have confounded it with faith or a man's *belief* in the remission of his own sins). It is, according to Catholic doctrine, a state of mind that necessarily shows its sincerity by outer works, making some atonement to God's offended justice, punishing the guilty flesh for what it has done, and bringing it into subjection (as St. Paul says), lest it be tempted to repeat the offence. These are what St. Matthew, in the same chapter (iii. 8), calls "fruits worthy of penance (or repentance)." And when our Lord speaks of what theologians call the "futile" penance of the Tyrians and Sidonians, He calls it penance, or a thorough change of soul, which they would have manifested by satisfaction or self-punishment, by clothing themselves with sackcloth and lying in ashes (Matthew xi. 21). Luther himself knew better, and in a moment of forgetfulness translates the same phrase *μετενοησαν* (the Ninivites *repented* or *did penance*), by the words, "sie thaten Busse," "they did penance." It is needless to add, that the "bessert euch" has disappeared from modern editions of the Lutheran Bible, and has been replaced by "Thut Busse," "Do penance." Whether this change was owing to Luther's own good sense, or that of subsequent editors, we cannot say, for the literary history of Luther's Bible has yet to be written. One thing is certain. In the beginning of his reforming career, he mistranslated Matthew iii. 2, in order to remove from the text the Catholic idea of penance or satisfaction which was in it, from the context and the unanimous interpretation of all the Fathers of the Church. His correct translation of Matthew xii. 41, shows that his mistranslation of Matthew iii. 2, was deliberate, and had its origin in malice.

Luther, growing wiser in his own conceit after some time, rejected from the sacrament of Penance, not only satisfaction but *confession* likewise. The necessity of confession, like some of the Catholic doctrines,<sup>1</sup> is clearly laid down in the unwritten word (*Verbum Dei traditum*), but is not so clearly defined in the written word (*Verbum Dei scriptum*). This is very natural, for the Scripture is not, what some imagine, a Catechism or Rule of Faith, or Summary of Christian doctrine. It contains, no doubt, a great deal of Catholic doctrine, but only what the *occasional* writing

<sup>1</sup> And some Protestant doctrines too: for example, the sanctification of the Lord's day. There is not a word in the New Testament about this precept, which rests solely on the authority of the Apostles, preserved for us by the tradition of the Catholic Church. The persistent attempt of some, to call it the "Sabbath," is unchristian and blasphemous, but it shows the disposition to reject Apostolic and Catholic authority, and fall back on the Old Testament or Jewish code, for a sanction of the day's observance. The "open Bible" and the "Sabbath" (the one never commanded, the other positively abolished by Almighty God), are the two idols, that the non-Catholic world has adopted in exchange for the "idolatry" of Romanism.



called for, whether it was the narration of facts, or the giving of admonition, rebuke and special precepts. But the duty of disclosing one's sins, as a necessary accompaniment of repentance, is more than once laid down, indirectly, at least, and in general terms (Matthew iii. 6; Mark i. 5; Acts xix. 18; James v. 16). But after awhile Luther was pleased to retain only the first part, which he confounded in some absurd way with faith, or *fiducia*, and to reject the second as a restraint upon what he called Gospel liberty, but to which the Catholic theologians of that day, and impartial history since, have given quite another name. In conformity with his usual plan, he seized the first opportunity to throw out the correct meaning of a text (Acts xix. 18) which had been confidently appealed to by Catholic theologians in support of the ancient doctrine. St. Luke says that many Jews and Gentiles, moved by the preaching and miracles of the Apostles, and by the Devil's failure to work false wonders in opposition, were filled with wholesome fear, believed, and came to the feet of the Apostles, confessing and telling their sins "*εξομολογούμενοι και αναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν*," or, as St. Jerome well has it, "*confitentes et annuntiantes actus suos*," and after him the Douay "*confessing and declaring their deeds*." How did Luther manage to eliminate the Catholic doctrine from the text? By referring the *αὐτῶν* to the Apostles, and the "*deeds*" to their signs and wonders.<sup>1</sup> He translates "*sie bekannten ihre Wunderwerke*" ("*they acknowledged their miracles*"), though *πρασσω* and *πραξις* were used of "*evil deeds*" by the good thief on the cross (Luc. xxiii. 41), and the context, taken in connection with the use of *εξομολογούμενοι* in the parallel places of Matthew iii. 6 and Mark i. 5, and James v. 16, can point to nothing else than the "*confession of sins*." Luther's disciples again blushed (and this is something) for their master's sacrilegious boldness, and tore out of the text his wicked perversion. It now reads "*und bekannten und verkundigten was sie ausgerichtet hatten*."

It is impossible to go over the "*one thousand and forty*"<sup>2</sup> errors and perversions of the text, deliberately made by Luther, in his translation. Neither time nor the means are at hand, as we have not a set of early editions which will enable us to trace those in which his corruptions of the sense were inserted and those in which they were removed by his own sober second thought, or by his successive disciples. We can only give a few specimens. One of

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Karl Werner's *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie* Schaffhausen, 1865, vol. xiv. p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> Such is precisely the number assigned by Emser, in his preface to *German New Testament*.

the cardinal doctrines of Luther, urged by him especially, and in the most forcible language, from 1521 to 1525 (the date of his own marriage, after which it utterly ceased), was the impossibility of continence or a chaste life. His phraseology, both in Latin and German, was not only impious and unchristian, but so vile, indecent and downright brutish, that it cannot be reproduced on paper before Christian eyes. Yet his filthy pamphlets, handling this point, were (by the kind offices of his friends) circulated everywhere in Germany, not only amongst the common people, but even through monasteries and convents. The crop of wantons that issued from their gates, clamoring for the liberty of the flesh, proved how well, and in what ripe soil, this enemy, the *inimicus homo* prophesied in the Gospel (Matthew xiii. 28), had sown his tares. It was in the Wartburg that he prepared his translation of the Bible, and it was there that he gave expression to the most shameful points of his reforming doctrine. Thence it was that he wrote his famous letter to Melanchthon, with the unblushing words "Esto peccator et peccata fortiter sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo. . . . Peccandum est quamdiu hic sumus. . . . Ab hoc (Agnos Dei) non avellet nos peccatum etiamsi millies millies uno die fornicemur aut occidamus."<sup>1</sup> It was in the same solitude, as he tells us, that he lived, "a prey to the raging fires of his untamed flesh."<sup>2</sup> This candid confession to his "alter ego," Melanchthon, will enable us to judge of the dispositions with which he approached the translation of those passages of the New Testament which have reference to celibacy, etc.

In 1. Cor. ix. 5, where the Apostle speaks of scandal, to which he and Barnabas would give no occasion, though for this purpose they waived an undeniable right, he asks: Have we not a right to take with us in our journeyings a woman of the Christian sisterhood, whose matronly care will free us from all solicitude about the necessities of daily life? Or as the words go, "Have we not power to lead about (to take with us in travelling) a sister, a woman, like the other Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" The word *γυνή* in Greek means "woman" in general, and sometimes also "wife," exactly like the French word "*femme*." This must be, and may always be safely determined by the context. Here the context evidently implies, not a wife, but a woman chosen from the Christian sisterhood or body (otherwise why refer to her

<sup>1</sup> "Be a sinner and sin bravely, but trust more bravely, and rejoice in Christ. . . . We must sin as long as we are in this world. . . . From this Lamb of God (who takes away the sins of the world, and whom it is enough for us to know), no sin can separate us, even though we should commit fornication and murder a thousand thousand times a day." Luther's Briefe (De Wette), Berlin, 1826, tom. ii. p. 37. The attempt to give a mystical or esoterical sense to these words, is too contemptible for notice.

<sup>2</sup> *Quin carnis mee indomitis magnis uror ignibus.* Ibid. p. 22.

by the name of *sister*?) who would free them from all earthly solicitude in their apostolic journeys. The other Apostles did this without scruple, strong in their own innocence and the unbounded veneration of their flocks. But St. Paul and (under his guidance) Barnabas, for peculiar reasons, to avoid all shadow of evil report, abstained from doing what was perfectly lawful and blameless in itself. All modern heretical versions (in order to countenance a married clergy) have rendered *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα* by "a sister, a wife." But Luther, bolder than them all, removes every probability of doubt, by *commenting* the text under cover of translation. He renders the words by "eine schwester ZUM Weibe" "for a wife" or "as a wife," thus forcing his own filthy conceit into the mouth of the inspired Apostle, by whom it was never uttered. This wicked perversion has not been removed from Luther's Bible, but remains there yet.

In 1 Timothy iii. 12, the Apostle, taking into consideration the state of the times, when seminaries and clerical education had not yet commenced, lays it down as a condition for the choice of deacons, that none shall be ordained who have been married more than once. "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife." Luther saw his chance, and turned what the Apostle had made a negative condition into an imperative obligation. This he did by his usual artifice of inserting words in the translation which are not found in the text. His version is "Die Diener, lass EINEN JEGLICHEN seyn eines Weibes Mann." "As to the ministers (deacons), let EACH ONE be the husband of one wife." It is needless to say that the words "einen jeglichen" are not in the original,<sup>1</sup> but were a gratuitous addition of Luther's. This corruption likewise remains to this day. In the preceding verse he had made use of a similar artifice. St. Paul had said, speaking of women who were connected with the service of the Church in any way, deaconesses, consecrated widows, or religious, "The women in like manner chaste." As if the better to explain his intention, he leaves *γύναικες* without the article *αἱ*. But Luther, followed in this by the Anglican version, translates "Desselligen gleichen IHRE WEIBER sollen ehrbar seyn," "Like themselves, THEIR wives shall be grave."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Διάκονοι ἐστῶσαν μίας γυναίκος ἀνδρες.

<sup>2</sup> In King James's Version, "Even so must THEIR WIVES be grave." We see no good reason why *σεμναι* should not be translated "chaste," as was done by St. Jerome. But "nescio qua teneritudine hæreticorum aures tenentur," if we may be allowed to parody the words used on another occasion by the same great saint. It was so translated in the early Syriac version, *nacphon*, which is rendered "chaste" by Dr. Murdoch in his "Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito," New York, 1879, p. 382. But on what principle of translation did Dr. Murdoch give us this strange rendering of the verse following: "Let the deacons be such as HAVE EACH one wife." Where did he find these two words in his original? They are not in any known copy in print or manu-



Heresy, being an inspiration of the fallen Archangel, has a natural tendency to hate and disparage those friends of God, who though born of dust, were called to fill the thrones from which himself and his rebel host had been driven, and above all that humble hand-maid of the Lord who was called to fill the highest place in heaven whose foot bruised the infernal serpent's head,<sup>1</sup> and who is hailed by the Church as the vanquisher of all heresies. Hence all modern heresy, with Luther at its head, has done its best to undermine the testimony of Holy Scripture in her favor. Luther translates the *κεχαριτωμένη* of the angel's address (Luke i. 28) by "Du holdselige" (Thou gracious one!) The Vulgate has correctly "*gratia plena*," and so too the Syriac "*maliat taibuto*" (full of grace), which are most probably the identical words in which the angel addressed her, if he used human speech, for this was her native tongue. And these are the very words with which the Church has ever greeted her from that day. Luther contended that instead of "Du holdselige," it would have been better and more German to say "Du liebe Maria" ("Dear Mary!") "Full of grace" he adds, "may be a word-for-word rendering of the Latin; but tell me, is it good German? When does a German ever speak thus: Thou art full of grace? Or what German understands the words, 'full of grace?' He must think of a barrel full of beer or a bag full of money."<sup>2</sup> This ribaldry is quite characteristic of Luther, but is not argument. Nor did it occur to him when he was translating John i. 14, where he considered "full of grace and truth" very good German for "*plenum gratiæ et veritatis*."<sup>3</sup>

script. Is it really a matter of necessity, that no one outside of the true Church can put a finger to Scripture, without feeling himself irresistibly impelled to distort its text in favor of his private opinions? It would almost seem so. We give the Syriac verse with its correct translation: "*Mshamshone nehwn, aino dahhdo atto hwot leh*," "Let the deacons be, he who *has had* one wife" (or in literal rigor, "to whom there *has been* one wife"). And thus it was translated two hundred years ago by a Protestant Syriac scholar, Martin Trostius, whom Dr. Murdoch would have done well to consult now and then. His version is semi-barbarous, but only because it is so literal. Here is his translation of the passage: "*Diaconi sint, is cui una FUIT uxor*." Does not this anticipate all cavil and mistranslation? But then we must remember that the Syriac version was made by honest, God-fearing, Christian men, and not in the interests of *heresy*.

<sup>1</sup> "*Quæ caput serpentis virgineo pede contrivit*" (Office of Imm. Conception). And in the *Officium Parvum*, "*cunctas hæreses sola interemisti in universo mundo*."

<sup>2</sup> "Sage mir aber, ob solchs auch gut Deutsch sey? Wo redet der deutsche Mann also: Du bist voll Gnaden? Und welcher Deutscher versteht, was gsagt sei, voll Gnaden? Er muss denken an ein Fass voll Bier, oder Beutel voll Geldes" (Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen, in the Erlangen edition of 1855, vol. lxx. p. 112).

<sup>3</sup> Eine Herrlichkeit als des eingebornes Sohnes vom Vater, voller Gnade und Wahrheit. Cf. Luc. ii. 40, "Voller Weisheit," and Luc. iv. 1. Also Acts vi. 3, 5, 8; ix. 36, and other places where Luther has no scruple to use phrases like the one to which he objected in the case of the Blessed Virgin. Verily it might be said to him in good German of his own coining "O du voll aller List und aller Schalkheit!" (Acts xiii. 10.)

It would be impossible to dismiss Luther without some mention of his famous falsifications in the third and fourth chapters of St. Paul to the Romans, where he forced his heretical system upon the unwilling text by thrusting into it, capriciously, when it suited his purpose, the particles *nur* and *allein* (*only, alone*). Thus in iv. 15, instead of the words "the law worketh wrath," he gives us "the law worketh **ONLY** wrath" (das Gesetz richtet **NUR** zorn an); and in iii. 20 for the language of the Apostle "by the law cometh the knowledge of sin," we have the Lutheran crotchet "by the law cometh **ONLY** the knowledge of sin" (durch das Gesetz kommt **NUR** Erkantniss der Sünde).<sup>1</sup> Rom. iii. 23, where the Apostle said, "They have all sinned," Luther translates "They **ARE** all sinners" (sie **SIND** alle Sünder), in order to teach under cover of the Apostle's authority that man's sinfulness is inherent even after justification. In the same chapter, v. 25 and 26, he again falsifies the Apostle's inspired words, by foisting into the text the system he himself had invented. In the former, St. Paul speaks of God's justice inasmuch as it is the *causa formalis* (to use the words of the Council of Trent) of the sinner's justification, not the justice whereby He is Himself just, but whereby He makes us just, where-with once gifted we are changed into new men, and are not only reputed but are called and are truly just. This idea of God's justice, ay, its very name, was odious to Luther, as he himself tells us,<sup>2</sup> and he drove it out of the text. Instead of "to the declaring of His justice," he translates "to show forth the justice, *that avails before him*,"<sup>3</sup> thus wickedly fastening upon St. Paul his own false theory of justice, not real but imputed. This is repeated in the next verse, the little word *αὐτοῦ* (His) being once more falsified and magnified into "which avails before him." But Luther's difficulties were not ended by this substitution. The next verse, 20th, openly declares that God is just and *makes just*. But no text, however clear, could stand in the way of this bold, unscrupulous monk. If Paul did not agree with him, he would compel agreement or submission. By the dextrous use of his pet word *allein*, he forces St. Paul to speak like a Lutheran. In place of "that He Himself may be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith," etc., he translates "that He **ALONE** may be just, and make just him who," etc. (auf dass er **ALLEIN** gerecht sey und gerecht mache den, etc.). The magical little word overthrows the Catholic doctrine of the Apostle and teaches Lutheranism. For if God alone

<sup>1</sup> This last corruption is no longer found in Luther's Bible. It has disappeared since the year 1530. But it may be seen, says Dollinger, in every copy printed from 1522 to 1529. "Die Reformation," Regensburg, 1848, vol. iii. p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> "Diesem Wort, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, war ich sehr feind." Walch's Ed., xiv. 460.

<sup>3</sup> "Damit er die Gerechtigkeit, die vor ihm gilt, darbiere."

is just, His making man just means nothing more than imputed or fictitious justice.

But perhaps bolder still was his attempt on verse 28, where with impious deliberation he forces into the mouth of the Apostle his own doctrine, that man is justified by faith alone. St. Paul says "For we account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law." This Luther shamelessly renders: "We hold that a man is justified without works of the law, by faith ALONE" (*ohne des gesetzes werke ALLEIN durch den glauben*). He is, if possible, more unscrupulous in verse 6 of the next chapter, where again he intrudes his doctrine into the text. St. Paul says, "As David also termeth the blessedness of a man to whom God reputeth justice without works." This Luther translates, "After which fashion David likewise saith that blessedness belongs ONLY to the man to whom God imputes justice, without *the aid* (or co-operation) of works." "Dass die seligkeit sey ALLEIN des Menschen, welchem Gott zurechnet die Gerechtigkeit, ohne ZUTHUN der Werke." Here blessedness (or God's friendship) is made to consist *only* in imputed justice, and the co-operation of good works is positively excluded. Supposing even that this were Paul's opinion, why put it into his mouth, where he never expressed it? Supposing him to have held the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this point, as she has ever taught and insisted, can madness and impiety be carried to a farther extent than to compel him, by mistranslation, to teach and preach the contrary of what he actually believed? Luther knew and confessed that the whole Christian world for fifteen hundred years had understood St. Paul in a different sense. He, therefore, in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans, cautions his readers, that if they would understand the Apostle correctly, they must pay no attention to the way his teaching had been explained by Thomas, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose and others still higher (this is a fling at an inspired Apostle, St. James), but must follow implicitly his (Luther's) interpretation. This is arrogant enough, but for fear it might not suffice to persuade his hearers, he deliberately changes the text of the Apostle to bring it into conformity with his new theories. Is there any plea that can be alleged in justification of this conduct? Was it zeal for the truth? A consciousness of profounder knowledge of God's revelation and the Apostle's meaning? Does it not on the contrary betray malice, the *versuta et fallax nocendi ratio* of which Cicero speaks, a wicked deliberate attempt to injure the Catholic Church and injure his readers by misleading them, to their eternal ruin?

The whole Christian world was stirred to indignation by these barefaced attempts of Luther to pervert the meaning and corrupt the text of Scripture. But in what spirit did he listen to those



protests? Did he offer excuse or apology? Far from it. He replied with insolent defiance, and only regretted that he had not made fuller and more sweeping changes in the text. His answer gives such an insight into the man's character, that we cannot withhold a few extracts:

"You may tell your Papists on my behalf, if you choose, that had I foreseen that all Papists put together were smart enough to translate correctly even one chapter of Scripture, I would have had the humility to ask their aid and help in translating the New Testament. But as I know and see plainly, that none of them know how to translate or speak German, I spared them and myself the trouble. . . . In the next place you may say, that I have translated the New Testament to the best of my power and according to conscience (!), have compelled no one to read it, but left it to his choice. . . . No one is forbidden<sup>1</sup> to make a better (translation). Whoever will not read it may let it alone. . . . It is MY Testament and MY translation, and MINE it shall be and remain. If I have committed any fault in it,—though I am not conscious of it, and would not willingly mistranslate even one letter (!),—I will not tolerate Papists as my judges. Their ears are too long, and their Ika Ika (braying) is too weak to judge my translation." . . .

"But to come back to the point, if your Papist annoys you with the word *sola* (ALLEIN, only) tell him straightway: Dr. Martin Luther will have it so—Papist and ass are one and the same thing. *Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.*<sup>2</sup> For we will not be scholars and disciples of the Papists, but their masters and judges. We'll bully and brag with these dunces, and as Paul boasts against his crazy saints, so will I boast against these asses of mine. Are they doctors? So am I. Are they learned? So am I. Are they preachers? So am I. Are they theologians? So am I. Are they disputers? So am I. Are they philosophers? So am I. Are they dialecticians? So am I. Are they teachers (Legenten)? So am I. Do they write books? So do I. And I will boast further. I can interpret Psalms and Prophets; they cannot. I can translate; they cannot. I can read the Holy Scripture; they cannot. I can pray; they cannot. And to come down, I know their dialectics and philosophy better than all of them put together. And I know, too, that not one of them understands their Aristotle. And if

<sup>1</sup> Yet Luther took good care to procure edicts from the German Protestant princes to forbid the printing and circulation of Emser's German (Catholic) New Testament. See his letter to John, Duke of Saxony, and another to Henry, Duke of Mecklenburg, in De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, iii. 528, 529, or in the Erlangen ed. of *Luther's Works*, vol. liv. pp. 112, 113.

<sup>2</sup> "Thus will I, thus command I, and for reason stands my will,"—a line of the poet, Juvenal.

there be one among them all that rightly understands preface or chapter in Aristotle, I will let them toss me in a blanket. I am not saying too much; for from my youth up I have been educated in all their arts. They know well that I know everything they know. Yet these godless people deal with me as if I was a stranger to their profession, who had only arrived this morning, and had never seen or heard what they teach or know. . . . By way of answer to their prattle and outcry I must sing with that wench, "Full seven years ago I knew that horseshoe nails were made of iron."

"Let this be the answer to your first question, and I beg of you to give such asses (in reply to their silly talk about the word *alone*), no other answer than this: Luther will have it so, and he is a doctor above all doctors in Popedom. This ends the matter. I will henceforth despise and hold them in contempt as long as they are such people (asses I mean) . . . How much art and labor are needed for translation, I know well by experience; hence I will allow no Pope-ass nor mule to judge or blame me. Whoever will not have my translation, let him give it the go by; the Devil's thanks to him, who censures it without my will and knowledge. If it has to be censured I will do it myself. If I do not, let my translation be left in peace, and let each one do for himself what he will, and so good-bye to him. This I can testify with a good conscience, that I have used the utmost fidelity and diligence therein and have never had a thought of falsehood . . . If the daubers and Pope-asses abuse me, pious Christians, with Christ their Lord, praise me, and I am richly rewarded, if even one Christian account me a faithful laborer. I care not for the Pope-asses, they are not worthy to appreciate my work, and were they to praise me, it would grieve me to the bottom of my heart. Their abuse is my highest glory and honor. I will still be a doctor, yea, an uncommon doctor, and this name they never shall take from me down to the last day; of this I am sure. . . . Translation is an art that is not within reach of every one, as these crazy saints imagine. For it there is needed a right pious, truthful, diligent, reverent, Christian, learned, practiced, experienced heart; hence I hold that no false Christian nor sectarian can translate honestly."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Darumb halt ich, dass kein falscher Christ noch Rottengeist TREULICH dolmet-schen könne." This candid acknowledgment, that it is hopeless to expect faithful translation from sectarian hands, almost makes us forget or forgive Luther's arrogant assumption (in the preceding clause) of all the virtues required in a good translator. Thus does divine wisdom elicit truth, not only from the mouths of innocent children (Ps. viii. 2) but even of reluctant enemies. Little did Luther imagine the importance of the principle here laid down. It is a Catholic principle as far as the theory goes. In his mouth it is a shameful confession, a terrible instance of involuntary self-accusa-

Luther then proceeds to justify his additions to the text in the Epistle to the Romans. He contends first, that these were required by the correct idiom of the German language; and, secondly (what he argues at some length), that they are in perfect accordance with the doctrine of St. Paul. The first reason, even if true, is worthless. For it is not elegance but fidelity that is the chief duty of one who translates Scripture. And Luther acknowledges that more than once he has sacrificed his German rather than depart from the letter of Scripture.<sup>1</sup> But these were places where nothing was to be gained, as the text did not furnish any room for alteration. But where heretical novelties could be introduced, it was done, and the propriety of German idiom was made the pretext. The reason given, however, is not only worthless, but untrue. For several other German interpreters, who understood their native tongue as well as Luther, did not think these additions necessary and left them out, or rather never dreamed of putting them in. We shall not discuss the truth of the second reason alleged. Even had it been distinctly revealed in one or more passages of Scripture, this would be no warrant for gratuitously thrusting it into other passages where the inspired writer does not mention it. This liberty once granted, the Scripture would soon become a very different book from what it was, when it first came from the hands of its Divine Author. But Luther had no certainty. It was only his opinion, and that opinion in direct contradiction with the firm belief of the Universal Church for fifteen centuries and more. This makes his boldness in altering St. Paul's text the more intolerable. He adds another reason, and it was no doubt his true and only one: to commend his own theory about good works, and draw men away from that of the Church. He was compelled to do it, he says, by the danger lest the people should keep hanging on to works, instead of faith, especially at a time when they were so addicted to works that they had to be torn away from them by force, which makes it quite right and even necessary to give out in the clearest and fullest way that faith alone without works justifies.<sup>2</sup>

---

tion and self-condemnation. What was Luther but a sectarian, standing alone against the whole Catholic world, when he set about inventing his religious system? *Solus eram*, as he himself says elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> Ich habe ehe wöllen der deutschen sprache abbrechen, denn von dem Wort weichen. All the foregoing quotations are taken from Luther's "Sendschreiben vom Dolmetschen," which may be found at page 104 of the 65th volume of his works. Erlangen ed. of 1855. We have not (for want of space) added the original German, but the reader may rely on the fidelity of the translation.

<sup>2</sup> "Zwinget auch die Fahr der Leute, dass sie nit an den Werken hangen bleiben und des Glaubens fehlen und Christum verlieren, sonderlich zu dieser zeit, der sie so lang her der Werk gewohnet und mit macht davon zu reissen sind: so ists nit allein recht, sondern auch hoch vonnöthen dass man aufs Allerdeutlichst und Volligsts heraus sage, allein der Glaube ohn Werk macht frumm." Loc. cit.



The thought of the advantage that his theory had derived from the falsification of Scripture, instead of being to him a source of shame and confusion, only begets in him a feeling of regret that he had not intruded into the text some additional words, to establish more firmly by its aid the Lutheran doctrine. "I repent," says he, "not having added, besides, the words *all* (any) and *of all* (of any), viz., without any works of any law, and thus spoken out fully and roundly." And as to the change already made there, he adds: "Therefore it SHALL STAY in MY New Testament (a truer word than Luther meant, for under his manipulation it had ceased to be the New Testament of the Evangelists and Apostles), and though all Pope-asses go raging mad, they shall never get it out."<sup>1</sup>

These passages are not merely specimens of the Reformer's controversial style, or of what Bullinger used to call "*caninam Lutheri eloquentiam*." They betray his true sentiments touching scripture, far better than his professions. He pretended great reverence for God's word, but it was only in as far as he could use it to his advantage, and make it subservient to his own word. His pretended reverence did not prevent him from corrupting and falsifying it when he could. This was not only his practice, but he elevated it, as we have seen, to the dignity of a principle. When the context was such that falsification was impossible, he would (to use his own vigorous expression) *break through* the text rather than submit to giving up his theory. If a passage contradicted his preconceived notions, he haughtily declared that he WOULD NOT ALLOW it to oppose his doctrine. A notable example of this is given in his correspondence with Melanchthon on the true meaning of 1 Tim. v. 12. Luther was determined to abolish celibacy, with what motives may well be imagined. But he had to find some warrant, real or pretended, in the Bible. He gives Melanchthon the result of his investigations, in other words his reasons for the step,<sup>2</sup> and asks for

<sup>1</sup> "Und reuet mich dass ich nit auch dazu gesetzt habe *alle* und *aller*, also ohn alle Werk aller Gesetz, dass es voll und rund ausgesprochen wäre. Darumb solls in meinem Neuen Testament bleiben, und sollten alle Papstesel toll und thöricht werden, so sollen sie mirs nicht eraus bringen." This and the foregoing passages may be found in vol. lxxv. of the Erlangen ed., pp. 104, 105, 107, 108, 113, 114, 115, and 118.

<sup>2</sup> See Luther's letters to Melanchthon of August 6th, and September 9th, 1521. The monk's crafty tactics prove his worldly wisdom, if nothing else. In his treatises and pamphlets written in the vernacular, and designed chiefly for the perusal of ignorant, relaxed, carnal-minded priests, monks, and nuns (for they abounded, and without them we should never had the Reformation), he appeals to their passions, and at times in such revolting, beastly language, that the only wonder is that it ever should have been allowed to appear in print. But of these arguments no trace can be found in his letters to Melanchthon, who would have seen through their hollowness and been disgusted by their downright wickedness. To his corrupt fellows of the church and cloister he commends marriage, nay urges it as an obligation induced by imperative laws of nature. To the lay theologian he speaks only of its allowableness and of how far this may be ascertained from Holy Scripture, etc.

his approval or decision to the contrary. He had come, he said, to the conclusion that priests might marry for the sufficient reason that celibacy was established by the Church, and her laws, like all human laws, cannot take away Gospel liberty. But this was only a battle half won. For reasons of his own, the marriage of Religious, bound by vows, lay nearer his heart. And here the passage of St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 12), was a dreadful stumbling-block in his way. For the Apostle speaks of widows consecrated by vow to the service of God who incur damnation by making void their faith pledged to a heavenly spouse. Therefore, according to St. Paul, the penalty of broken vows is damnation, and this presupposes deadly sin. Luther twisted and writhed under the pressure of this text, could find no solution, and was not satisfied with that proposed by Melanchthon. In his anguish he wished that Christ were on earth again to explain away these words of His Apostle. But the confidence that HE was right, whatever Scripture might say, supported him in the struggle. His boldness returned, and he saw clearly that he had but one way of escape left, viz., to "make use of the liberty of the spirit, and break through what opposed the salvation of souls."<sup>1</sup>

He soon, urged by the spirit that ruled within him, carried out his purpose of using the "liberty of the spirit" (liberty of the flesh was its true name), and determined that this troublesome text should no longer stand in his way. How he was to get rid of it, was a matter of less importance. He would either set it down as beyond the reach of interpretation by reason of its obscurity, or he would make out that these vows had been made with the liberty of faith, *i. e.*, with the reserved intention of breaking them whenever it might suit "Gospel liberty" to do so. He would not yield to the text, NOR ALLOW IT to stand in the way of his doctrine.<sup>2</sup>

When it is remembered that all English Bibles, translated or rather mistranslated in the interests of modern heresy, are based on the Bibles of Luther and Beza (of whom we shall speak hereafter), the reader will see the propriety of investigating the work and character, the exegetical practice and principles of those interpreters before examining the English translations. When it is question of true merit, it is hard to find a copy which does not fall behind the original. But where all the merit consists in daubing and disfiguring, it is not so difficult.

<sup>1</sup> Ut prope mihi libertate spiritus utendum esse videatur, et PERICULUM, quidquid obstiterit saluti animarum. De Wette, Luther's Briefe, tom. ii. p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> "Locus ille Pauli de viduis damnatis superest, quem NON PATIAR adversari huic sententiae de lege et fide; neque ei concedam, potius obscurum comiteion, aut sic intelligam, quod illae viduae libertate fidei voverunt." Ibid. p. 49.

## BOOK NOTICES.

COUNTERPOINTS IN CANON LAW: A reply to the Pamphlet, "Points in Canon Law," and to the American Catholic Quarterly Review, of October, 1878. By *Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.* Newark, N. J.: J. J. O'Connor & Co. 8vo., pp. 105.

Here is a formidable pamphlet of over one hundred pages, which Rev. Dr. Smith has thought fit to write in defence of his former book, "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," against the strictures of Rev. Dr. Quigley, of Cleveland, Ohio, in his "Points of Canon Law," and against a critique of the same book, which appeared in our number of last October. The pamphlet is ushered into the world under favorable auspices, bearing on its face the Episcopal *imprimatur* of Dr. Smith's ordinary, and a commendatory preface by one of our most estimable theologians, Rev. Dr. Pabisch, of Cincinnati. Besides this, it is stated in the "Introduction to the Reader," that many valuable suggestions and corrections have been added to the pamphlet by Rev. F. Konings, O.S.S.R., and Rev. Dr. Pabisch, both of whom revised and corrected the MSS., and even the proof-sheets "with great care and trouble." So, in a certain sense, it may be regarded as the joint production of three distinguished divines, whose fame is justly widespread through the country. How far they have succeeded in refuting the points made by Rev. Dr. Quigley, or the criticism of the REVIEW, is freely left to the judgment of the intelligent reader. Passing by for the present the portion that refers particularly to the Cleveland Divine, who is fully competent to argue his own case, we shall devote a few paragraphs to what is said in reply to the REVIEW.

It is well for Dr. Smith and his reputation, that he has listened to good advice, and in undertaking his defence has placed himself, so to speak, in the hands of his friends. It is to their prudent revision, in all probability, that we owe the moderate, good-tempered tone which characterizes his present work. Had he been allowed to conduct his own defence, he might have been tempted to write in an angry strain. His zeal in what he considers the cause of truth, and his extreme sensitiveness not only to reproof, but even to legitimate criticism, might have hurried him into a disregard not only of social propriety, but also of what is due to his own high standing as author and clergyman. In a word, he would or possibly might have substituted abuse for argument, and denounced his critic instead of defending himself. In place of calm discussion, we might have had only angry recrimination and unseemly personalities. There is no reason why this should be so; but it happens only too often, especially when an author has studied his subject so long, so fondly and earnestly as Dr. Smith has done, and has besides a deep, abiding faith, which nothing can shake, in the solidity of his own judgment, and the unfailing accuracy of his own conclusions.

How wisely Dr. Smith has acted in contenting himself with furnishing the arguments, and allowing others to mould his style, will be apparent to any one who has read Dr. Smith's two letters, in defence of his *Elements*, published in the New York *Tablet*, of last November. It is enough to say that they were regarded by his many friends as not written in the best taste, and not likely to add to the reputation of the distinguished author. The argument, excellent as it might be, was buried and lost under its outward coating of angry words and coarseness. It



speaks well for the Doctor, that he has seen his mistake, and intrusted to other hands the task of managing his style, of keeping it within bounds, and preventing it from becoming the vehicle of personal abuse instead of (what it should be) the calm exponent of reasoning and argument. Though his book is mainly a reproduction of his letters, besides omitting whatever could give just cause of offence, he has re-written his points, before sending them to his fellow-laborers for friendly corrections and a suitable dress. They have done their part, no doubt, in binding up (to use the language of Holy Writ) what was broken, in strengthening what was weak, and in preserving what was fat and strong. But for his own sake we owe them special thanks for having eliminated from his pages every harsh, angry, and abusive word. They have imparted a good share of their own urbanity to the writer. Why did they not go further, and infuse some portion of their own candor into the controvertist?

This is the only fault we have to find with Dr. Smith. He lacks candor. His book has in it a good deal of research and erudition, and bristles with quotations. But it is not always fair and candid, as a book of the kind should necessarily be. Yet without this, controversy can only degenerate into a mere exchange of hostile words which prove nothing, conclude nothing. For what can be proved by appeals made, not to the reason, but to the prejudices or passions of the reader! Dr. Smith has an unpleasant way not only of not stating in its true light the point at issue, but also of not quoting correctly from an author or from his adversary. And in the whole range of controversy there is nothing more annoying, than to have to deal with one who mistakes your point, or garbles what he quotes. These things may happen to Dr. Smith, innocently or inadvertently, in the heat of argument; but they are none the less vexatious to an opponent, and prejudicial to the reader. We must justify what we have said by an example or two.

The author returns to insist that the Council of Baltimore was not approved by Rome, nor even confirmed, except in a very loose way; and that bishops and priests may appeal even now against its decrees to the Holy See. This seemed to us a loosening of the bonds of church discipline, a step towards encouraging bishops and priests to disregard the legislation of Baltimore as having no intrinsic binding force. We added, that we had never heard such doctrine before, save in the mouth of a priest restive under censure; that in his practical strait it was intelligible enough, but that such theory should be propounded by a grave professor and priest in good standing, was very strange. This, he intimates, is an unjustifiable insult, a thinly-disguised comparison between himself and a suspended priest. How can you deal with a man so morbidly sensitive (to call it by a mild name), that he construes every word, even the most innocent, into an insult? There is here no thin disguise, no comparison, but a strong broad contrast between a bad and a good priest, and the good priest is pleased to resent it as an affront! We should unhesitatingly, to-morrow, use the very same language of the most estimable priest or bishop of the country, who should happen to hold this crotchet about Baltimore legislation and tried to convince others of its truth. We wish the reverend gentleman were half as candid as he is sensitive, and could bring himself to abstain from garbled quotation of our words. Here is the way he quotes them in § 23:

"Our last remark relates to this passage of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW: 'We never heard the opinion (of Dr. Smith, that the Baltimore Decrees were not confirmed *in forma specifica*) expressed before, save by some priest who was restive,' etc."

Now, would not every reader suppose that the words in parenthesis were copied from the REVIEW, either in their present connection, or as a statement given elsewhere of Dr. Smith's opinion? Yet it is no such thing. It is a gratuitous interpolation as it stands. No such words are found in the REVIEW, either here or anywhere else; nothing that even faintly resembles them. When we stated the Doctor's opinion, we used merely the following words, "Neither our bishops nor our priests are bound by the Decrees of the Baltimore Councils." The expression "not confirmed in *forma specifica*" does not occur once in the pages of the REVIEW.

It is useless to discuss here the question of confirmation, special or general. For no matter how clear it might be, Dr. Smith would be furnished by canonists with a dozen quirks, quilllets and dodging-places to elude its power and darken its evidence. We merely make a remark for the benefit of the general reader. Most of the subtleties and technicalities of Canon Law apply to those countries where it has subsisted for centuries, and are in great part retained as yet by Rome in transacting ecclesiastical business with those countries. But it is not in the same way or in the same spirit that she deals with the American Church, which is more intimately dependent on her than the Churches of Europe. The ruler's commands to his subjects, when they form a regular code of law, fall into the hands of interpreters, lawyers, and tribunals, till at last by dint of glossing and interpreting, ruling and counter-ruling, they are enveloped in a mist of uncertainty, that often sadly impairs their value and efficiency. But the commands that he gives to those of his own household, to those immediately dependent on him, are very different. There is no reasoning out their meaning, no gloss or commentary. The consequence is that they are readily understood and cheerfully obeyed. We look on the relation of the Pope and his Roman tribunals to the American Church somewhat in this light. We are more closely and intimately connected with him and them, as our spiritual rulers, than are the Churches of Europe. When the Pope commands our bishops and priests to observe inviolably the Decrees of Baltimore, we know what he means, and take him at his word. We do not, certainly ought not, go delving among the Reiffenstuels and Schmalzgruebers for subtleties and quibbles to elude our plain duty of obedience.

Dr. Smith lays it down as a rule that Roman documents "most uniformly use the word *recognoscere*, never the word *confirmare*." This is scarcely correct. It is enough to take up the collection of Provincial Councils of Baltimore, published by Murphy & Co., in 1851, and run over its pages, to discover the contrary. Every Council that contains the document approving its acts and decrees (and they all have it but one, the second, where it was omitted by neglect or carelessness of the editor), has the words "confirm" and "confirmation" repeated over and over again. In the Decree for 1st Council (p. 62), it is used four times. In the Decrees for the 3d Council (p. 145-147), six times. In that for the 4th Council (p. 189), four times. In those of the 5th (p. 226-29), six times. In the 6th we have (p. 254), once, "*decreta Apostolica confirmatione munita*," and again, with same phrase somewhat varied, "*Apostolica auctoritate sancire et approbare*." In Decree of 7th Council (p. 289), *confirmare* twice, as also *probare* twice, and *approbatio* once. Of the others, except the 10th Provincial Council of Baltimore, we have no copy. And from it we may learn the true meaning of *recognoscere* as applied to Decrees of American Councils, whatever may be its technical sense in canonical casuistry. Dr. Smith says, "Every Latin scholar knows that

the word *recognoscere* means simply to *revise*." This is not its only meaning in good Latin, as will appear from any dictionary. Nor would any schoolboy who has read Cicero's Oration, "pro Rege Dejotaro," imagine that the timid orator had presumed to "revise" imperial Cæsar to his face, when addressing him with the words, "Simul ac te recognovi." But the question is, what is its meaning in ecclesiastical Latin? The letter of Cardinal Barnabo to the President of the 10th Baltimore Council, would indicate that its meaning does not stop short at revision. He says, that "after an accurate examination of all the acts of that Council (post accuratum omnium, quæ in Synodo gesta sunt, examen), the Sacred Congregation, after commending the zeal of the Fathers for the maintenance of discipline, etc., 'illius decreta censuit esse recognoscenda.'" How will Dr. Smith translate this? "Decided that its decrees were worthy of revision?" What? The result of accurate, complete revision is nothing more than a decision that the acts are entitled to *revision*! *Recognosco* here is clearly the same as *probo* or *confirmo*. And the sequel shows it. For the Cardinal immediately adds, "Which decision of the Sacred Congregation his Holiness kindly confirmed (*confirmavit*) and commanded that the decrees be promulgated and observed throughout the whole Province of Baltimore."

As regards the first Provincial Council of Baltimore in particular, to remove all cavil, it is worthy of remark that Pope Pius VIII., who was a celebrated canonist, of his own full, personal knowledge (to use Dr. Smith's words, p. 12), gave the confirmation of his Apostolic authority to the Decrees of that Council. Cardinal Capellari (afterwards Gregory XVI.) is our witness. In the Decretum of confirmation, he says, that "Whereas, the Sacred Congregation, to throw greater lustre round the Council, and give more stability to its decrees, unanimously asked His Holiness to confirm them by his Apostolic authority; the Holy Father read them, not summarily but thoroughly (*perlegit*), and weighed them in his wisdom (*pro summa sua sapientia perpendit*), and having confirmed them by his Apostolic authority, commanded that they be observed in all the dioceses of the United States of North America." When we take into consideration that the famous Decree "*Quoniam sæpius*" (now known as No. 108 of the Second Plenary) was enacted in this Council, the significance of this confirmation becomes apparent. This is the famous Decree about the bishop's power relatively to pastors of souls, viz., that he has power to appoint and to recall them. Had this Decree never been enacted or failed to find its way into the Second Plenary, no one would ever have dreamed of agitating the question, whether an appeal may not lie against the Baltimore legislation, as not confirmed by the Pope, and possibly in conflict with the general law of the Church.

Dr. Smith tries to answer our objections to his having written the Elements in English. And if he had stated them correctly, we should listen to his reasons on the other side and remain open to conviction. But here he is disingenuous, as usual. This is the way in which he quotes our words:

"The QUARTERLY thus states the objection: 'In the first place the book is written in English. And this is a fatal objection. Latin is the language of the Catholic Church, and is likewise, or should be the language of our schools and of our textbooks. Outside of the Catholic Church, the wicked spirit of heresy prompts her enemies to hate the Latin language.'" (Counterpoints, No. 133.)

This is given as one continuous, unbroken quotation from the Quarterly. The third sentence has no connection with the two that preceded it, and very likely his amiable intent was to make it appear, that



the QUARTERLY had written nonsense. What will the reader say when he is informed, that between the second and third sentence (after the word "text-books"), full fifteen lines have been omitted. And yet no sign, not even a dot or two to indicate the break!

The gist of the passages so artfully suppressed was this: "One innovation leads to another. English textbooks of Canon Law will soon lead to dogmatic and moral theology in English, and this will extend to English philosophy in our ecclesiastical seminaries. The acquisition of Latin will be reduced at last to merely enough to read (and, perhaps, partially understand) the Missal and Breviary. And thus, thanks to these wicked innovations, the Latin tongue, the preservation of which is one of the glories of the Roman Church, will fade away and become truly a dead language. It is her language, our Mother's tongue, and, therefore, we all, laity and clergy, should teach our children and our seminaries to love, revere, and cherish it. Let us learn a lesson from our enemies." And here came in very properly the reference to what goes on outside of the Church. But Dr. Smith adroitly tacked it on to the propriety of writing in Latin, in order to put into our mouth the inference, that whoever writes on these subjects in English is impelled by the wicked spirit of heresy. Would he dare to lay his hand on his conscience, and say that there is any such inference contained or implied in our context before it was garbled to suit his purpose? Why, then, does he insinuate it? Yet insinuate it he does, and at great length, by a parade of religious authors who have written in the vernacular, and a series of triumphant questions after their names, inquiring if they were prompted to write in the vernacular by the wicked spirit of heresy? Thus he introduces the venerated names of Cardinal Gousset, Father Perrone, Father Hill, and even of St. Alphonsus, to make out that the REVIEW, by inference at least, charges them with being "prompted by the wicked spirit of heresy." It is hard to deal patiently with this paltry trickery. Luckily Dr. Smith has preserved the sentence on which his charge is based, though he has torn it from its connection. We shall in turn put a question to him: "Are St. Alphonsus, Father Perrone, Father Hill, and the rest, 'enemies of the Church,' 'outside of her pale,' '*haters* of the Latin language?'" We spoke of no others. Then why drag in these honored names to lend color to his false insinuations? Where did we ever say that the spirit of heresy prompted any writer, good or bad, Catholic or heretic, to write in the vernacular on religious subjects? We said it prompts men "outside of the Church," and "her enemies," to hate Latin because it is her language, and we gave this merely as a reason why we should love it. It is a pity that the Very Reverend revisers of his book did not show their concern for his reputation by mending its manners as well as its style.

It is not our purpose to go over again the question of the essential irremovability of *parochi*, especially with such an opponent, whose aim seems to be to darken and hide the truth,

Obscuris vera involvens,

not like the poor Sibyl, because she could not help it, but of a set purpose. We contended that the idea of *parochus* does not necessarily involve that of *irremovability*. If it did, there could be no such thing as a "*parochus amovibilis*." But "*parochi amovibiles*" are recognized by the Council of Trent ("*Concilium Tridentinum admittit parochos amovibiles*," says, expressly, Giraldus), by the Holy See, the Roman Congregations, and by the most distinguished canonists. The chief and

noblest function of a parish priest is to have the charge of souls especially intrusted to his care. All the rest is secondary and trilling. Now, as Giraldus says, in this respect there is no difference between the removable and the irremovable parish priest. "Nulla, quoad animarum curam exercendam, datur differentia inter parochos amovibiles et perpetuos." Dr. Smith, with his usual want of candor, charges the QUARTERLY with maintaining "that *all* parish priests are now removable *ad nutum*." Had he quoted, without garbling, there would have been no room for such an assertion. Here is the way in which he quotes the QUARTERLY. Of its expressions on this score, he says:

"Taken as they stand, they can have but one meaning, to wit, that according to the law or discipline of the Church, irremovability is not only no essential element of the office of parish priests proper, but even that *all* parish priests are at present removable *ad nutum*. In fact, the QUARTERLY expressly asserts this. Here are its words: 'The contrary (*i. e.*, the removability of parish priests) is now the law of the Church.'"

How innocently that little parenthesis, written by Dr. Smith, has crept into its hiding-place between the words of the QUARTERLY! Its object will be seen hereafter. He misrepresents our reasoning in two ways. First, he must surely remember enough of logic to know that when one constructs an argument on the false premises of his adversary, he does not thereby undertake to avouch, nor can he be held responsible for, the truth of the *consequens* (conclusion) but only for the *consequentia* or logical sequence, *i. e.*, the intrinsic connection between premises and conclusion. We argued thus. If essential irremovability had been given to parish priests, when first instituted by the law-making power of the Church, it would follow, since she now recognizes removable parish priests, that she has abrogated her former enactment, and that the contrary is now the law (or discipline) of the Church. This hypothetical conclusion is set down by Dr. Smith as our positive expression. Is this fair and honest?

In the second place, though not logically held to the truth of a hypothetical conclusion based on his premises, we do not refuse to sustain that the proposition "the contrary is now the law of the Church," even in its positive form, is true. What does "the contrary" mean? Here we may see the significance of the little parenthesis, so artfully foisted into the text by Dr. Smith. He would entrap the reader into the belief that the "removability of parish priests" is the contrary. This is not correct. The opposite of "essential irremovability" is not simply "removability," it is "non-essential (or contingent) irremovability." When in natural theology or ethics the question arises, whether the soul be essentially immortal or not, excellent and most Christian authors are to be found who take, some the affirmative, others the negative side. But the latter, by denying its essential immortality, do not thereby undertake to affirm and prove simply its "mortality." They hold that the soul, not being essentially immortal, may be either immortal or mortal, as it pleases God. And, as it has pleased Him, so it happens. The inferior soul in beasts is mortal, and will be annihilated; the souls of higher degree in man *might* possibly, but of a certainty will not be annihilated, immortality having been accorded to them by God's goodness, not as their inherent right, but as His gift, that He might verify His own word: God alone can claim immortality in His own right (*solus habet immortalitatem*. 1 Tim. vi. 16). The opinion of these theologians (we need not discuss its probability or improbability) illustrates very well the case before us. There is no such thing as essential irremovability contained in the idea of parish priest. By

denying this we are not limited to holding that they must thereby become all removable. No; they may well be (what their essence allows) either removable or irremovable. Some the Church leaves in the former state; to others (and they are the greater number) she accords the right of irremovability. It is her gift, and no right inherent in the office. Itself and the office are alike the creation of her will and power.

The Reverend author (Counterpoints, No. 154) calls in question our veracity. This is not polite, but we overlook it, though perhaps it should not have been overlooked by the friendly revisers who undertook to reform his controversial style. We stated that Cardinal Soglia recognized such a thing as removable parish priests, and in proof quoted his words, "sive perpetui sive amovibiles parochi sint," and as a necessary precaution, we marked the edition by the place of printing, year, volume, and page. It is rather hard, after this, to be suspected of coining the passage. We are willing to take his word, that it is not found in the Neapolitan edition he cites. He will not take ours, that it is found in that of Bois-le-duc, 1857. Our copy is at his service, or that of any of his friends, that they may verify the quotation, if they will.

Again, speaking of Ferraris, we ventured to say that, looking through our edition, we had not been able to find the words quoted from him by Dr. Smith, viz., "rectores stabiles, perpetui," but that we would admit them on his authority. This acknowledgment, of which no one need be ashamed, elicited only a coarse jocular reply from Dr. Smith, in his Letters, wisely weeded out of the pamphlet by his cautious advisers. Little did we then know of the Doctor's loose style of quotation, or we might have used our eyes to better advantage. It turns out that the word "perpetui" has been dragged up from a distance of eleven paragraphs, and placed by the side of "stabiles," the latter word being in § 3, and the former in § 14. It is true that it makes not much difference in sense, but it is rather unkind to sneer at him, who had accepted it as a *bonâ fide* quotation.

And besides (*quod minime reris*) that staid old German Jesuit, Leurenus, proved a great source of vulgar merriment to the author of the Letters. The Reviewer candidly confessed that he had no copy of Leurenus, and was, therefore, unable to verify the quotations adduced by Dr. Smith. But he ventured to add, that he felt sure they would turn out on examination to be nothing more than reiterations, more or less diffuse, of the Tridentine formula, "perpetuum peculiaremque parochum." The mirth, which this elicited in the Letters, was considered by the revisers too low and indecorous to be retained in the pamphlet, but in its place they have allowed to appear a misrepresentation. In "Counterpoints" (No. 138), it is said that the Reviewer gives three reasons against the correctness of Dr. Smith's statement of the question about essential irremovability. He states them in order (*a, b, c*), and thus quotes the third: "(*c*) that Leurenus does not stand up for the affirmative side." To say nothing of the awkward, improper, and incorrect way in which these words have been dragged out of their natural context, we merely ask a question: Did Dr. Smith really mistake for positive argument on the Reviewer's part, a surmise, a mere guess as to the possible contents of a book he acknowledged never having read? Or did the Reviewer ever say, much less offer as argument, that "Leurenus DOES not stand up for, etc.?" He knows that the Reviewer never said anything of the kind. But he states it nevertheless, and thus artfully prepares the reader's mind for a future page (Nos. 159, 160) where the disclosure will be made, that this barefaced Reviewer by his own acknowledgment has never read a line of Leurenus. Again, we ask, is this fashion of con-



troversy fair and honest? Would it not be unseemly in a man, who possesses nothing but mere worldly honor? Then, what must it be in men of our calling, who should aspire to something higher than the glory of carrying our petty point for the moment by dint of cavil and sophistry, making light of truth and wounding charity? "*Crede mihi Torquate*" (we must say with the grand old Pagan philosopher), "*ad altiora et magnificentiora nati sumus.*"

The Reverend author insists that the Reviewer has totally misconceived the meaning of the Tridentine expression, "*perpetuum parochum.*" He says that the "*perpetuum*" means "*irremovable.*" This we never denied, but merely stated that the Fathers in their use of the word were thinking of something very different from "*essential irremovability.*" By these words "*perpetuum peculiaremque parochum,*" the privilege (or right as far as it now exists) of irremovability was extended to parish priests—not to all, but to the greater number. This is stated by Soglia, Ferraris, and others, whom our author quotes approvingly. But he thinks we are "*incorrect*" (No. 168) in saying that, in passing such law, or according such right, the Fathers had in their minds and intended to abolish forever the abominable practice of administering parishes through "*parochi conductitii*" or clerical hirelings. If we have erred, we can plead in our defence the best authority. Without falling back on Devoti, Zallinger, Corradi, Barbosa, Pirrhing, or other musty canonists of times gone by, we appeal to an author of our day, whose testimony Dr. Smith is not likely to reject. Here are his words. After quoting the legislation of the Council of Trent on this point, he says:

"The law of the immovableness of priests having the care of souls was enacted, as we have just seen, in order to put an end to the hiring of temporary substitutes" (Rev. Dr. Smith, *Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore*. New York, 1874. Sect. 25. Irremovability of Parish Priests, No. 121).

We come to the last topic treated of by the reverend author of Counterpoints, viz.: the lawful exaction of voluntary offerings. If there be anything ludicrous in the juxtaposition of such words, the fault is not ours. Even here he must have recourse to his usual unscrupulous mode of quotation. He says (No. 186), "Next the QUARTERLY in support of its assertion 'that priests have no right to claim even *per modum stipendi* any offering for baptisms, etc.,' quotes the words of the Roman Ritual." This putting of words into our mouth which we never used, by the help of quotation-marks, is intolerable. Did we or any one else attempt it in his case, it is very likely that his perceptions of right and wrong would be aroused, and he would denounce it as dishonest. Dr. Smith, we say it without any disposition to flatter him, has talent and ability enough to argue his case without having recourse to these despicable artifices, and he should be ashamed to employ them. Their use is not to his credit, and detracts from whatever there may be that is sound or worthy of consideration in his argument. We do not tender advice, for probably he would resent it, but merely throw out a thought which he may ponder with advantage. If it had not been for these arts of his, our reply to his reasoning would not have extended beyond a few paragraphs. Let him in future consult his own interests and those of the reading public by giving his opponent only argument to refute, and allowing him no chance of exposing trickery.

We never wrote any such passage, but on the contrary grant elsewhere that the priest's maintenance may furnish just cause for fees, etc., limiting it, however, to its due meaning and becoming expression. The giving such alms, when necessary (or appointed by authority) "*ad con-*

gruam sacerdotis sustentationem," is the result of duty on the part of the people. They are bound by divine obligation to support him who ministers at their altars; but to say that a priest may and ought to *exact* this, is a needlessly offensive way of stating it. It may suit the dry, heartless style of a canonist, writing in a learned language; it is not the ordinary style of the Church. For one line that she has written in favor of the priest's "claims," she has written a thousand and more "ad coercendam clericorum cupiditatem," to use her own expression. And what is still worse, this talk about the right "to exact" is extended to matters where it cannot possibly exist. Dr. Smith sneers at our calling the practice of exacting a price for burials and funeral service "something wicked and horrible." Let him remember that the words are not ours, but of a Sovereign Pontiff, Alexander III., in the Third Council of Lateran, and reaffirmed in the Fourth Council of Lateran.

The Reverend author contends that "eleemosyna" and "exaction" are not incompatible, because the Fathers of Baltimore in the Decrees (No. 386), speak of alms to be required in certain matrimonial dispensations. This is true, but does not warrant his general inference. And the author himself has told us why, in another of his books (Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, p. 318), "It is a *penance* imposed on the petitioner for the liberty granted by the dispensation." Both in her internal and external forum the Church can exact voluntary actions as a penance. And she exercises this power every day. Will the reverend author call funeral offerings "a penance imposed" by the Church? But let us learn a lesson from the Church, who is wiser and choicer in her speech than some of her thoughtless ministers and her rugged canonists of the *Ferrea vox*, or iron tongue. With them it is ever "rights" and "claims," "demanding," "exacting," and "compelling." How significant and suggestive, on the contrary, how much more in unison with the Gospel we preach in her name, is the word she loves to use, *eleemosyna*? Even when these voluntary offerings are absolutely needed for the due maintenance of her ministers, though an obligation of conscience thereby arises on the part of the Christian people, yet she will not use the harsh words *debt* or *claim*, but holds still to the gentler, softer, original name of *alms*. And though she gives a parish priest full sway in spirituals and the control of temporalities in his church, she will allow no one to be his own judge in this case, but will have the offerings regulated by higher authority: "Illis eleemosynis contenti sint . . . quas ordinarius constituerit," says the Roman Ritual (De Exeq.).

But, besides the "eleemosynæ" approved or appointed by the bishop, are there not other voluntary offerings, depending only on pious custom ("laudabilis consuetudo"), which may be exacted as a right, and recusants compelled to pay by the bishop's court? This is affirmed by our author, after Craisson, who follows Devoti, who follows N. N., etc., who pretends to have got it out of the Council of Lateran, whose decrees charity compels us to hope they never read. To these names the author in his pamphlet adds several; he might have added a great many more. But *cui bono*? He would only succeed in proving that some canonists, like parrots, may repeat each other's words; and like silly sheep (*pecore matte*, as the great poet calls them), blindly follow their blind guides in the interpretation of passages, without even taking the trouble to read the canonical text they pretend to gloze. But all this was known already. And why should it not happen among canonists, when it happens daily amongst moral theologians and other tractators of theology and its supplemental branches? Every petty professor (or at

least two out of three) of Canon Law, Moral Theology, Liturgy, etc., nowadays must give out his "Course," multiplying textbooks without necessity, having no claim to originality, no pretence of deep study or research. Now and then something of sterling value may appear, but how rarely! Any one acquainted with the current theological literature of Italy, France, and Germany in our day (for it is to these countries our observations are chiefly directed), say during the last fifty years, must be aware of this. They only cull from this and that quarter, not always tastefully; repeat in a slovenly way what had been better said before them, and if their guide has blundered, they innocently blunder in his footsteps.

Why, then, does Dr. Smith seek to terrify us by an array of names? Witnesses, in our case, are to be counted by weight not number—*ponderandi non numerandi*. Otherwise the Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore could be proved to be the work of the first centuries. One or two of them are great names. We are willing to give way before them, with all deference and humility, in any matter of speculative opinion. But in a plain matter of fact, we do not feel equally willing to be led by the nose. For the sake of argument we will grant, that the payment of voluntary offerings is compulsory, and that the faithful who break the law may be (ought to be, if you will, *cogendi*) prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts and compelled to pay. This, then, is the law; and the only question left is: Where is it written? Reiffenstuel and Laymann, and consequently the whole *servum pecus* of their modern copyists, all without exception, give the sixty-sixth canon of the Fourth Lateran Council. We can only conclude that they have not read it; if they have, they have read it so carelessly as to misunderstand and misinterpret its meaning. They would have us think that the canon was directed against recalcitrant laymen. It was directed, as its heading shows, against clerical greed. "De eadem (sc. simonia) circa cupiditatem clericorum." What is said of the laity, comes in as an afterthought, only *per incidentem*. They think the canon contemplates close-handed parishioners, unwilling to pay their dues. On the contrary the portion of the canon in question was framed against laymen who were heretics, and who under the guise of a purer Christianity (they called themselves Cathari or Puritans), made war upon the Church and her clergy. They say such reluctant Catholic parishioners are to be dragged into the bishop's court for having refused payment, and condemned to pay the missing fees. Not a word of this in the canon. But these wicked laymen, not Catholics, but Patarini, imbued with the leaven of heresy and influenced by the same (*Ex fermento hæreticæ pravitatis*), and who *on that account* (not refuse or neglect once or twice to pay their dues, but) exert themselves to break down the pious practice of voluntary oblations, are to be summoned by the bishop of the diocese, and brought before his court, not disciplinary but inquisitorial, for this is a matter of faith not of discipline. There is he to take cognizance of the truth of the allegation, and if he find them *guilty*, he is to restrain them, keep them within bounds, punish them. Guilty of what? Of non-payment of dues? So says M. Craisson ("Recusantes"), amongst others. But the Council knew and understood, and knew how to explain, its own mind better than canonists have since succeeded in doing, because they would not take the trouble to read the Decree. The Fathers of Lateran say "guilty of *malice* in striving to overthrow a laudable custom." It is not then a disobedience springing from avarice or penuriousness, but a contempt openly evinced for Church usages, and originating in *malice*, i. e., heretical hatred of the Church and her sacred ministry. Is there any



foundation in all this for the assertions of Craisson and Dr. Smith? We have conceded for the present that offerings are compulsory dues and that they may be collected by legal process in the bishop's court. But is it so written in the Council of Lateran, to which all of them refer, and on which solely they rely? This is a question of fact, which any student is as competent to examine as Laymann, Craisson, or Dr. Smith. The latter studiously avoids all discussion of the canon itself, content to pile up the names of those who understand the canon as he does. Our opinion may be singular, but if convinced we are ready to change it. That our readers may have a chance of judging for themselves, here is the Canon itself with translation:

"Ad Apostolicam audientiam frequenti relatione pervenit, quod quidam clerici pro exequiis mortuorum et benedictionibus nubentium et similibus pecuniam exigunt et extorquent; et, si forte cupiditati eorum non fuerit satisfactum, impedimenta fictitia fraudulenter opponunt. E contra vero quidam laici laudabilem consuetudinem erga sanctam Ecclesiam, pia devotione fidelium introductam, EX FERMENTO HÆRETICÆ PRAVITATIS nituntur infringere sub praetextu canonicæ pietatis. Quapropter et pravas exactiones super his fieri prohibemus, et pias consuetudines præcipimus observari: statuentes ut libere conferantur ecclesiastica sacramenta, sed per Episcopum loci, veritate cognita, compescantur qui malitiose nituntur laudabilem consuetudinem immutare."—(Mansi's Collection of Councils, Venetiis, 1778, tom. xxii. col. 1054.)

"By frequent reports it has been brought to the knowledge of the Apostolic See, that some clergymen exact and extort money for funeral services, for the nuptial blessing, and for other things of the kind; and unless their greed be satisfied (by the parties who apply) they fraudulently bring forward fictitious impediments. And on the other hand some laymen being imbued with the leaven of heresy, under pretext of pious observance of the canons, try to break down the laudable usage (of offerings) in regard to Holy Church, which has been introduced by the pious devotion of the faithful. Wherefore we forbid these wicked exactions and order that pious usages be maintained; decreeing hereby that the Sacraments of the Church shall be imparted gratuitously, but that all those who maliciously endeavor to change the (above mentioned) laudable usage shall, after judicial inquiry, be kept within bounds by the bishop of the place."

In this whole matter at issue, we are aware of the disadvantage under which we labor. Dr. Smith finds himself on what in more than one sense may be called the popular side. He is not unconscious of the vantage-ground which he occupies, nor does he fail to use it for his purpose. And he, too, in turn, is used, for their own purposes, by his friends and backers, from the puny village paper to the grave and sober magazine. Let him rest content with his partisan advantage, and not eke it out further by invoking impartial names, great and honored, to bury us under the weight of the argument *ad verecundiam*. He omits no opportunity of informing the reader, that the authors whom he quotes and follows, and with whom we have presumed to disagree, are praised and commended by Popes and Prelates. Thus De Herdt's Praxis was highly extolled by Cardinal Bartolini. M. Craisson's book was examined by Roman censors, and bears in front a congratulatory epistle of Pius IX. to the author. Cardinal Soglia's work was honored by letters from two Pontiffs, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. The inference from all this—the author does not venture to put it in words, but wishes it to creep silently into the reader's mind—may be stated as follows: "My reverence for Pius IX., of blessed memory, and for the Holy See, to which I

have unhesitatingly submitted all the teachings, theological, moral, and canonical, of my pamphlet, impels me to follow without doubt or question every opinion found in those authors whom Rome has consecrated by her august sanction. But how different, how unlike me, is that naughty Reviewer! He may not be, and I charitably hold he is not, a Turk exactly, or a Freethinker, but I must doubt his orthodoxy. He has no respect for the Craissons and others, whom the Pope has honored with his commendatory letters. In despising them, he despises and insults the Pope and his counsellors."

This is no play of imagination, but it is distinctly stated that the Reviewer has *insulted* Mgr. Roncetti and Professor Angelis by finding fault with Craisson's book, which they examined. These are not Dr. Smith's own words, but expressions of an anonymous "reverend friend," writing to Dr. Smith, who indorses the language by giving it a place in his pamphlet. By the way, the reverend author should not have been allowed to allege anonymous authority so freely in his pamphlet. We are treated to long extracts from great theologians, distinguished canonists, learned friends, all anonymous, not one of them having either name or *habitat*. Such testimony is worthless and must be ruled out of court. He ought to have remembered, and his friendly advisers or fellow-laborers ought to have reminded him, that a writer who cannot or will not quote fairly or honestly what is in print before the eyes of all, has debarred himself in logic and law alike from the right to appeal to written testimony, which no one but himself has seen or read.

To come back to our point, the reverend author of the pamphlet knows very well what is the just value of most letters of approbation, whether emanating from censors in Rome or in America, or from bishops or even the Pope. Had he sent a copy of his own "Elements," to the Holy Father, accompanied by a letter of filial devotion, he knows very well that Pius IX., that most kind-hearted and most amiable of men, would have sent him back a congratulatory letter, with which his publisher no doubt would have adorned the pages of the second edition. Had he obtained it, he knows very well that our opinion of the exact value of his "Elements" would not be altered in the least, and that neither he nor any of his friends would venture to make of the papal letter an *ægis* for his "Elements." Why, then, should a congratulatory letter of Pius IX. be shaken threateningly in the face of critics and reviewers, to inspire them with due reverence for M. Craisson? Of the many bishops who gave—what shall we call them to avoid giving offence to the delicate ears of our fastidious canonist?—friendly letters to the author of the "Elements," we are convinced that not one of them ever conceived the idea, that the Reviewer was guilty of either insult or disrespect in their regard, for presuming to find fault with that book. Perhaps, some of them, for all we know, took it in very good part.

Before closing we wish to correct a mistake into which Dr. Smith has inadvertently fallen. We happened to say, that in some place he has given "by way of warning to bishops," the true, correct sense of the word "*eleemosyna*." He thinks this was said *animo maligno*, with a view to poison the minds of the bishops against his book. Never did he shoot wider of the mark. We can assure him that we considered it, on the contrary, not only lawful but commendable for him to lay down the law for the instruction (which includes warning) of our bishops. They are bound by law, as well as priests, and not being either infallible or impeccable, they may mistake the extent, or fail in the discharge, of their obligations. It was commendable in him to do it, for we have

heard of some abuses in this very matter, not general but local, which deserve condemnation, and may yet receive it, at the hands of Rome.

To conclude, we have been able to give only a hurried and superficial review of this pamphlet, which was sent us at a late hour, when the REVIEW was preparing for the press. Though we have been compelled to write in haste, we hope this has not influenced our temper. We are glad to bring our remarks to an end, and hope never to have occasion to return to the subject.

---

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION; or, The Scriptural Cosmology, with the Ancient Idea of Time-worlds in Distinction from Worlds in Space. By *Taylor Lewis*, Professor in Union College. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1879.

The design of this work is to "set forth the Biblical idea of creation, philologically ascertained, or 'creation as revealed,' in distinction from any scientific or inductive theory of the earth." Dr. Lewis "thinks that he can truly claim that this is the first attempt to discuss the question at any length from the Scriptural or philological side." In making this assertion he does not wish "to seem unjust towards the pious and able men who have of late defended the twenty-four hour hypothesis," and explains that with them "the exegetical is far from being the predominant element." The learned author has adopted the general idea, suggested by St. Augustine, that the "days" spoken of in Genesis are periods marking successive processes or stages in the formation of the earth.

In developing and endeavoring to prove this, Dr. Lewis examines laboriously and minutely all the Scriptural texts which he thinks throw light upon the subject, and comparing and analyzing them, subjects them to a rigorous exegetical examination.

To those who are concerned about the attacks of infidels upon the Mosaic record, on the assumption of its discrepancy with scientific conclusions, so-called, the work will be highly interesting; but to those who are grounded in the faith that "the world was framed by the Word of God," it seems rather a waste of learning and ability.

As regards the main question which the work discusses, there are only three possible positions:

First, Catholics, certain of the absolute infallible truth of divine revelation as interpreted by the Church, observe without the slightest concern, as to ultimate consequences, the assumed irreconcilability of scientific discoveries with divine revelation. They know that truth is consistent with itself, and that when the last meaning of every real discovery in the natural world is reached and understood, it will be found not in contradiction to, but in perfect harmony with revelation. Hence when a fact, or supposed fact, is set up against the truths of Christianity, they at once conclude, on grounds of the highest reason, that either the alleged fact is *not* a fact, or else that its true place among other facts, its relations to them and its real meaning, have not yet come to be correctly understood.

Hence, on the one hand, the Church regards not only without apprehension but with pleasure, investigation and study in every sphere of human knowledge, and not only does not forbid nor discourage them, but fosters and promotes them, knowing that when their ripe fruits shall all have been gathered in, and their final results shall have been reached, they will furnish new illustrations and confirmations of her own doctrines.



Secondly, There are the rationalistic scientists, who assume the certainty of human science and deny or ignore divine revelation. They undertake to pursue a like process to that of Catholics, but in the reverse order. Catholics test the assumptions and supposed conclusions of science by the certain, unerring truths of revelation as taught infallibly by the Church; scientists, on the other hand, undertake to subject divine revelation to the test of the supposed truths of science. They attempt to overthrow the certainty of faith by the uncertainty of scientific assumptions and theories based on partial and incomplete investigations, whose final results and last meaning have not yet been reached.

"Evangelical Protestants" form the third class. They, confessedly, have no certain elements whatever to start from in their attempts to solve the questions raised by scientists. They profess, it is true, belief in an infallible Bible; but they are entirely at sea as to its interpretation. Thus, uncertain on the one hand as to the meaning of divine revelation, and, on the other, uncertain as to the real results of scientific investigation, they resemble persons who attempt to evolve a known quantity out of two that are unknown.

Even supposing that Dr Lewis's laborious and minute exegetical examination of Scripture texts were correct, we do not perceive that he has contributed anything towards the "reconciliation" which he deems so important. Supposing that he showed clearly that *his* interpretations of Scripture were in perfect harmony with the scientific theories of the day, he would have to do his whole work over again to-morrow. For scientific theories are continually changing. Opinions that were tenaciously held a few years ago, are given up to-day; and those of to-day are plainly in process of being superseded by others in the near future. When human science arrives at positive, absolute, unchangeable knowledge of the ultimate meaning of what it investigates and studies, it will be time enough to compare its results with the teaching of divine revelation. To attempt it sooner seems to us very much like chasing a will-o-the-wisp.

---

EDUCATION AS A SCIENCE. By Alexander Bain, LL.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879. 12mo. pp. 453.

This book is the twenty-fifth of the International Scientific Series. It is in keeping with the others; and we consider it by far superior to Dr. Bain's other contribution on *Mind and Body*, which seemed to us very crude.

The author's view is different from that usually taken of education, inasmuch as he attempts to place it upon a scientific basis. But we do not regard his effort as altogether successful. In real science the whole subject and its method flow from a few well-understood principles. Now the basis of a science of education is psychology and moral philosophy. In these must its principles be grounded. But Dr. Bain, though in some manner or other dealing with these subjects, fails to lay down the principles they disclose. In their stead he is content to assert some surface observations in reference to the workings of human nature.

We are prepared for some strange disclosures on the subject of moral and religious training, when we remember that Dr. Bain is not of the Scotch school of Reid, but rather of a materialistic school that has many points of contact with the teachings of Mill, and Herbert Spencer, and Darwin. For example, the religious question he dismisses in this flippant manner: "People might well be satisfied, as far as regards the school, with

the markedly Theistic and Christian vein of all the lesson-books, and with the great susceptibility of the young mind to the explanation of the world by a personal God. Any results beyond should be sought somewhere else" (p. 424). We need scarcely add that the results of such a training would be anything but Christian. They are such as would suit Messrs. Herbert Spencer and John Fiske. They would be the destruction of all religion. Dr. Bain is beyond his depth in treating of this burning question. To be part of a man's thinking and the principle of his actions, religion must surround him from the cradle to the grave, everywhere guiding and instructing him, on all occasions, under all circumstances, his protector and good angel. It must be as intimate a part of his existence as his breathing. On the moral and religious bearing of education we cannot recommend *Education as a Science*. But there is a book which we would like to see in the hands of every thinker and educator. It is a work written by Dr. Stapf, of Germany, and translated into English and published in Edinburgh many years ago. It is called in its English dress *The Spirit and Scope of Education*. We suggest to our enterprising Catholic publishers its republication in this country. It is admirable on all those points on which the book under review is weakest. And it is as fully entitled to the claim of being a scientific treatise.

In the instructional part of his book Dr. Bain says many good things. But when he starts off on a crusade against the study of the Latin and Greek languages, he drops a great many essential quantities out of his reckoning. For the Catholic student the Latin language must always hold an almost sacred character. It is the language of the Church. It is the language in which she speaks to the faithful in all parts of the earth. It is the language in which is preserved the record of her glories and her triumphs, her struggles and persecutions, and the lives and words of her saints and her learned men. But it were almost sufficient reason for the study of Latin that in it is written the *Summa* of St. Thomas. Catholic colleges cannot dispense with the study of the classics and retain their claim to the title of Catholic. It may do well enough for the sophists of the hour who have no part to study, or to whom the past is a reproach, or who would have their disciples know no other horizon than that which their farthing candles reveal. The descendants of the Gregories and the Leos, of Augustine and Aquinas, must have a better training and a nobler education.

THE DAWN OF HISTORY: An Introduction to Prehistoric Study. Edited by C. F. Keary, M.A., of the British Museum. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The study of prehistoric times is of comparatively recent date. But, brief as is the period since it has become a specialty, we can trace a like change in its progress and history to those which have occurred in astronomy and geology. It is within the personal recollection of many of the readers of the REVIEW, when both of these branches of physical science were popularly supposed to threaten the overthrow of the truths of divine revelation. Every spouter and smatterer who aspired to be regarded as *liberal* or *advanced* in his ideas, appealed to real or supposed astronomical or geological facts as containing indubitable proofs that the Scriptures could not be true. In like manner archæological investigations into the history and antiquities of Egypt were confidently appealed to as successfully impeaching the earlier Old Testament writings. A few

years passed, and when a careful sifting of the results attained in all three of these branches of science was made, and crude surmises gave place to more thoughtful reflection, the results were found confirmatory, in different and independent ways, of the statements of divine revelation. The study of prehistoric times is evidently passing through a similar process. A few years ago it was confidently predicted that it would disprove, beyond all question or doubt, the common origin of mankind. Already, however, it has been found that instead of leading to any such conclusion it furnishes many strong proofs of the unity of the human race. In like manner it was supposed that it would confirm the popular theory, among modern physicists, of evolution, and furnish incontestable evidence that the primitive man was a savage but little removed from an ape; yet already the more careful and thoughtful students of prehistoric times have come to feel, on scientific grounds, that such a conclusion would not only be premature, but irreconcilable with many ascertained archæological facts.

The work before us is an important contribution to the study of prehistoric times. It is made up of essays by two English scientists, H. M. Keary and C. F. Keary, M.A., of the British Museum. As a summary of facts and materials collected by various archæological investigators it is valuable. To criticize the opinions expressed or implied in its pages, strikes us as a waste of time. For, as is well remarked in the preface, "Prehistoric science has not yet passed out of that early stage when workers are too busy in the various branches of the subject to spare much time for a comparison of the results of their labors," when, one may say, "fresh contributions are pouring in too fast to be placed upon their proper shelves in the storehouse of our knowledge." Under such circumstances it is evident that for any scientist to undertake to dogmatize or make positive assertions on the basis of processes of investigation that are confessedly still progressing and far from complete, would be the height of folly.

Yet incomplete as these prehistoric studies are, they have progressed far enough to knock to pieces the crude, but self-confident theories, based on discoveries, real or supposed, respecting the stone age, that man started as a debased savage.

---

BISMARCK IN THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR, 1870-1871. Authorized translation from the German of *Dr. Moritz Busch*. Two volumes in one. Authorized Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This work is intended to be a life portrait of Bismarck during the memorable seven months of the Franco-German war. The author had rare facilities for studying the character of the person he undertakes to depict. He was an attaché of the Count's ministerial bureau, and his medium for inspiring the public press, particularly in Germany, and to some extent in England also. He was a member of the household of the Imperial Chancellor, or, as he was then called, the Chancellor of the Confederation, and was immediately attached to his person during the whole period of the war and the negotiations for peace at its close.

A pen portrait of Bismarck made by a person enjoying such facilities for becoming intimately acquainted with his habits, ideas, and private character, it might be supposed could scarcely fail to be in the highest degree interesting. Dr. Busch's work, however, fails to fulfil this reasonable expectation. He has endeavored, consciously or unconsciously, to fill to the Chancellor of Germany the part which Boswell



did to Johnson, but he lacks the sincerity and truthfulness of Boswell. He is a sycophant, but his very sycophancy is inspired rather by self-interest than by honest admiration. He was, according to his own account, nothing else than a hireling writer, whose chief work was to "inspire" German newspapers with the sentiments Bismarck suggested, and very often to deny and misrepresent well-known facts, and to state as facts what were known to be not facts. There is every reason to believe, too, that his journal of Bismarck's conversations "at dinner, at tea, and on other occasions," was revised by Bismarck himself. Consequently Dr. Busch's accounts are not records of what Bismarck actually said, but of what he wished to be reported as having said.

Yet perfect disguise is impossible. The most skilful concealment fails at one point or another to prevent glimpses, at least, of truth. And reading under or between the lines of this record of Bismarck's table talk, enough comes to view to show his vanity, his intense egotism, his utter want of moral principle, his cold-blooded selfishness, arbitrariness, and cruelty. He was intensely jealous of all others. Dissatisfaction and discontent seemed his chronic condition of mind. The suggestions of his fellow-councillors were regarded as officious intermeddling, and no one, from the King down, was correct or right in anything he said or did, except himself. He continually complained of the manner in which the war was conducted, of the slowness of the Generals, and of their want of severity. Though France was devastated wherever the German troops marched, Bismarck complained that they were too merciful. That every village was not burned, and that every French *tireur* who was taken prisoner was not at once shot, was to him a constant and sore grievance.

---

THE GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH GRAMMARS, with an Introduction, Historical and Critical; the whole methodically arranged and amply illustrated: To which are added four Appendices, pertaining separately to the four Parts of Grammar. By *Goold Brown*, author of "The Institutes of English Grammar," "The First Lines of English Grammar," etc. Tenth Edition. Revised and improved. Enlarged by the Addition of a copious Index of Matters. By *Samuel E. Berrian, A.M.* New York: William Wood, 27 Great Jones Street. 1879.

This admirable work has been before the public so long and has obtained so firmly an established and high a position as a standard authority on the subject of English grammar, that to praise it seems superfluous. We confine our notice, therefore, to a few statements of the author taken from his preface, of his own design of the work. "It is not," he says, "a work of mere criticism, nor yet a work too tame, indecisive, and uncritical; . . . not a mere philosophical investigation of what is general or universal in grammar, nor yet a minute detail of what forms only a part of our own philology; . . . not a mere grammatical compend or compilation." The work is all of these, but it is more. It is intended to describe the best method of studying and teaching English grammar, to facilitate the study of the English language, to settle, so far as the most patient investigation and the fullest exhibition of proofs could do it, the multitudinous and vexatious disputes which have hitherto divided the sentiments of teachers, and made the study of English grammar so uninviting, unsatisfactory, and unprofitable, to the student whose taste demands a reasonable degree of certainty."

This edition of the work has been carefully revised or improved by an eminent master of English grammar. The typography and binding are of a style suitable to the valuable contents of the work.

HEALTH AND HOW TO PRESERVE IT. *Professor McSherry*, University of Maryland, Baltimore. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1879.

The reading of this work is about as good an example of the *utile dulci* as one can readily find, for the matter is most interesting, whilst the style is in the author's well-known pleasing manner of imparting information—in a conversational way. The work is simply scientific common sense, and must command a widespread study when known. There are few works of a medical character which do not bristle with technical terms, usually frightful to the uninitiated, whilst many such books treat of specialties certainly not intended for, nor suitable to the majority of the members of a family. This book, however, not only can be read by any one, but should be studied carefully by all who are interested (and who is not?) in the great subject on which it treats. It would certainly save ten times its cost every year were people to follow the sound advice therein contained. May we not indulge the hope that the distinguished Professor will continue to give us more and more of his extended experience and deep knowledge, since "preventives far exceed cures," and these efforts are in the right direction, and will bring incalculable good to the community at large.

---

MOTIVES OF LIFE. By *David Swing*. Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co. 1877.

If there were any room for doubt that Protestantism was fast lapsing into sheer infidelity, it would be dispelled by glancing over this little work. Its author is a prominent and acknowledged representative of what is called *Liberal Christianity*, yet there is not one thought in the work that might not have been expressed by a heathen. The name of Christ is found in its pages, but you might substitute for it that of Confucius or Socrates, or Zoroaster or Brahma, without injury to the sentiments expressed, unless it be that such a substitution would necessitate a less feeble recognition of the existence of truth as an actual reality, and a stronger expression of the actual need of a divine revelation to man. The only idea that we can get from the whole, is that life, whether that of the individual or of the human race, is nothing more than a constant but confused movement, and that when this movement happens to be in the right direction, it is towards unattainable truth—a conclusion entirely consistent with sheer skepticism, but utterly irreconcilable with belief in divine revelation.

---

DIATIKI, ETC.: The New Testament, or the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito version. By *James Murdock, D.D.* New York: Carter & Brothers, 1879.

The idea of the translation was a very good one. Dr. M. was charmed with the simplicity of the Peshito, and determined that others should share his pleasure and delight. Hence this translation. The Syriac version, no doubt, excels in clearness, and there is scarcely a passage in it that presents mere verbal difficulties. Whatever difficulty there may remain is not to be ascribed to the interpreter but to the obscurity of the meaning hidden under the revealed words. We intend to examine in our next some of the rules that Dr. Murdock has prescribed for himself in undertaking the translation, and how far he has complied with them. It will be seen that while at times very exact in his rendering, at others he is loose and not always faithful. Yet his undertaking is a step in the right direction, for the Peshito is a valuable aid to the exegesis, especially, of the New Testament.



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- MONTH OF MAY; or, A Series of Meditations on the Mysteries of the Life of the Blessed Virgin, and the Principal Truths of Salvation, for each day of the month of May. From the French of Father Debussi, S. J. Translated by *Miss Ella McMahon*, and revised by a Member of the Society of Jesus. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. An excellent and edifying manual of devotion. 1879.
- STATES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND VOCATION, according to the Doctors and Theologians of the Church. By *Rev. J. Berthier*, Missionary of Our Lady of La Salette. Preface by *Rev. Joseph Shea, S. J.* With the approbation of the Master of the Sacred Palace, and of his Eminence, Cardinal McCloskey. New York: P. O'Shea. 1879. 12mo., pp. 292.
- INTRODUCTIO IN SACRAM SCRIPTURAM ad usum Scholarum Pont. Seminarii Rom. et Collegii Urbani de *Prop. Fide*, auctore Ubaldo Ubaldi Presbytero Romano SS. Liter. Professore. Vol. Secundum: Introductio Critica, pars secunda et tertia. Romæ: ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide. 1878. Large 8vo., pp. 643.
- FIDEI ET MORUM FUNDAMENTA. Seu Instructio Brevis pro Omnibus, qui Salutem in Veritate Querunt, nec Expeditam rei Tanti Momenti Investigandæ Opportunitatem Habent. Auctore J. Van Luytelaar, C.S.S.R. Neo-Eboraci, Cincinnati, S. Ludovici, Einsidlæ: Benziger Fratres, Summi Pontificis Typographi. 1878.
- LECTURES, ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION, as Illustrated by the Religions of India. Delivered in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, in April, May, and June, 1878. By *F. Max Müller, M.A.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879. 8vo., pp. 382.
- THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE SECOND CENTURY; or, The Age of the Antonines. By *W. W. Capes, M.A.*, late Fellow of Queen's College, and Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. With two Maps. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.
- EARLY ROME. From the Foundation of the City to its Destruction by the Gauls. By *W. Ihne, Ph.D.*, Professor at the University of Heidelberg, Author of "The History of Rome." With a Map. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- THE ENGLISH REFORMATION; How it came about, and why we should uphold it. By *Cunningham Geikie, D.D.*, Author of the "Life and Words of Christ." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879. 8vo., pp.
- DESTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION. Personal Experiences of the Late War. By *Richard Taylor*, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE MYSTERY OF THE CROWN OF THORNS. With Practical Devotions. By a *Passionist Father*, Author of "The Christian Trumpet," etc. D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1879.
- THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES. By *J. Harris Patton*, Author of the "Concise History of the American People." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE MULTITUDINOUS SEAS. With illustrations. By *S. G. W. Benjamin*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE FAIRY LAND OF SCIENCE. By *Arabella B. Buckley*, Author of "A Short History of Natural Science," etc. Illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- OCEAN WONDERS. A Companion for the Seaside. Freely illustrated from living objects. By *William E. Damon*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- A LATIN GRAMMAR, founded on Comparative Grammar. By *J. H. Allen* and *J. B. Greenough*. Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1878.
- LATIN LESSONS, adapted to Allen & Greenough's Latin Grammar. Prepared by *R. F. Leighton, Ph.D.* Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1878.
- HEALTH PRIMERS. By *Botts & Bothing*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.







